



Technological University Dublin
ARROW@TU Dublin

Dissertations

Social Sciences

2008-09-01

A Study Of Anti-Social Behaviour on Dublin Bus Routes

Kevin Scott

Technological University Dublin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/aaschssldis>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scott, Kevin: A Study Of Anti-Social Behaviour on Dublin Bus Routes:Masters Dissertation. Dublin, DIT, September 2008

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Sciences at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact yvonne.desmond@tudublin.ie, arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, brian.widdis@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#)



A Study Of Anti-Social Behaviour on Dublin Bus Routes.

A thesis submitted to the Dublin Institute of Technology in part
fulfilment of the requirements for award of Masters (M.A.) in
Criminology

By

K. Scott

September 2008.

Supervisor: M. Seymour

Department of Social Sciences, Dublin Institute of Technology.

DECLARATION

I hereby certify that the material which is submitted in this thesis towards the award of the **Masters (M.A.) in Criminology** is entirely my own work and has not been submitted for any academic assessment other than part-fulfilment of the award named above.

Signature of candidate:.....

Date:.....

ABSTRACT

The area under investigation was the phenomenon of criminological behaviour occurring on Dublin Bus Routes. Research questions were based around: 1) what anti-social behaviour is occurring on buses, 2) when is this behaviour occurring, 3) who is perpetrating this behaviour and 4) how is anti-social behaviour on buses being tackled? Two problematic bus routes and one control route were selected based on geographic spread and the comparative ratio of criminal incidents involved (the 78A, 77 and the control case: 46A). A statistical analysis of existing information from Dublin Bus surrounding anti-social behaviour on these routes was conducted. The researcher then performed equivalent systematic observation over a period of three weeks on the proposed routes. This data was supplemented with four semi-structured interviews obtained from members of the Dublin Bus *Zero-Tolerance Unit*. The data garnered from the observation and the interviews was then cross-examined against the statistical analysis of existing data to see how comparable it was. The results showed a bias in the reporting of more serious crime with a lot of minor incidents never being recorded. The findings were used to inform academic recommendations for future research with regard to the nature of anti-social behaviour on buses and how it is *policed*. Practical solutions to effective management strategies in dealing with crime were also suggested.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Firstly I would like to greatly thank my supervisor: Dr. Mairéad Seymour for giving me a lot of guidance as to the direction and structure the thesis should take. The feedback given on drafted sections proved to be invaluable in improving the final document.
- I would also like to thank Mark Kelly for granting me access to the *Zero Tolerance Unit* and facilitating meetings with operations managers in the three bus depots.
- Sean Lavin (Conyngham Road), Terry Fitzgerald (Ringsend) and Marie Beegan (Donnybrook) were most helpful in making official records available and a pleasure to deal with.
- I must also thank the four members of the *Zero Tolerance Unit* who participated in the interviews.
- Another person whom I am thankful to is Garrett Kennedy who acted as an invaluable sounding board through the course of the research.
- I would like to give a special thank to my bosses in Dublin Bus, Claire O'Connor and John Leonard, who were very accommodating and flexible with my employment hours while I was working on the thesis.
- Lastly and most importantly I would like to thank my family and friends for all their encouragement and support while I have been conducting this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

~ Title Page (I)	
~ Declaration (II)	
~ Abstract (III)	
~ Acknowledgements (IV)	
~ Table of Contents (V)	
~ List of Tables (VI)	
~ List of Appendices (VII)	
~ Introduction (1)	
~ Rational (3) [Benefits of Transportation]	
	[Transportation Usage]
	[What is Anti-Social Behaviour?]
~ Literature Review (6) [Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses]	
	[Nature Of Crime/Disorder On Buses]
	[Criminological Relevance (Fear Of Crime/Broken Window Theory)]
	[Spatial Issues]
	[Profile Of Offenders Involved In Anti-Social Behaviour]
	[Preventative Measures To Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses]
	[Responses To Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses]
	[Zero-Tolerance Policy Towards Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses]
~ Methodology (14) [Aim of the Study]	
	[Data Collection Methods: Existing Official Statistics]
	Observation
	Interviews]
	[Analysis]
	[Access, Consent And Ethical Considerations]
	[Limitations Of The Methodology]
~ Findings (20) [The Nature Of Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses:	
	Incident Type
	Incident Severity
	Incident Location]
	[When Does Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses Most Commonly Occur?]
	[What Type Of Individual Is Most Likely To Perform Anti-Social Behaviour On A Bus?]
	[Are The Preventative Measures Being Employed Effective And Could They Be Improved?]
~ Discussion (32) [Criminological Relevance (Fear Of Crime/Broken Window Theory) Revisited]	
	[Spatial Issues Revisited]
	[Nature Of Crime/Disorder On Buses Revisited]
	[Profile Of Offenders Involved In Anti-Social Behaviour Revisited]
	[Preventative Measures And Responses To Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses Revisited]
~ Conclusion (40)	
~ References (43)	
~ Appendices (47)	

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Methodology Section:

Table 1: Breakdown of The Raw Data.

Table 2: Breakdown of The Bus Routes.

Findings Section:

Table 1: Official Statistics For Incident Types.

Table 2: Observational Statistics For Incident Types.

Table 3: Official Statistics For Incident Severity.

Table 4: Observational Statistics For Incident Severity.

Table 5: Official Statistics By Route.

Table 6: Observational Statistics By Route.

Table 7: Official Statistics Timeline of Incidents.

Table 8: Observational Statistics Timeline of Incidents.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics For Male and Female Involvement.

Table 10: Incident Severity For Male and Female Involvement.

Table 11: Age Brackets Of Offender Involvement.

Table 12: Driver Response To Anti-Social Incident.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Anti-Social Behaviour Chart.

APPENDIX B: Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire.

APPENDIX C: Consent Form For Interviews.

APPENDIX D: Zero Tolerance Unit Interview Transcripts.

INTRODUCTION SECTION

The following dissertation is concerned with anti-social behaviour on buses. The format comprises six sections: introduction, rationale, methodology, findings, discussion and a conclusion (which contains recommendations). The introduction gives: 1) a brief overview of the different theoretical concepts to be examined in more detail later on in the thesis, and 2) a breakdown of the practical work conducted in the current research.

An article written in *The Dublin People* (2008) about anti-social behaviour on Dublin Bus noted that: the Neilstown Road, Ronanstown and the Fonthill Road had not been serviced by the 78A after 19:30 between July 5th and July 18th 2008. This occurred due to a spate of anti-social behaviour on the route: physical and verbal assaults, stone throwing and drug taking being the areas of most concern for bus drivers.

The problem of anti-social behaviour on buses encompasses many different parties: from the offenders to potential passengers and the bus companies.

Firstly to address anti-social behaviour from the bus companies perspective. In the United Kingdom the Department of transport (2004) noted that the biggest anti-social problem was vandalism (damage to windows followed by damage to seats). Even relatively small offences (graffiti cost bus operators £0.6 million in 2002 and arson £150,000), drained resources (Department of transport, 2004).

In Ireland, Dublin Bus as a company serves almost 500,000 passengers everyday and from their viewpoint safer public transport: reduces passenger's insecurity and means higher patronage during off-peak hours, less money spent on repairing damage, lower staff absenteeism and less disruption to services (European Conference for Ministers for Transport, 2003).

Potential passengers tend to perceive anti-social behaviour as being more commonplace than it is in reality (Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research, 1997). This shows one of the wider implications of the value of this research. Namely to help inform the general public as to the prevalence of crime on public transport (specifically buses) and to help allay fears that it is as widespread as the media would like to portray (Romer and Jamieson, 2003).

As to those responsible for causing anti-social behaviour and when it occurs, the literature suggests that the answer to these questions are two-fold. 12-16 year old youths going to and from school are listed as the group most likely to engage in anti-social behaviour (Scottish Executive, 2005), alongside night-time offenders. The second group may consume excessive quantities of alcohol and as a result behavioural problems are liable to occur (Lovatt and O'Connor, 1995).

Due to time and resource limitations on the part of the researcher it was primarily the 12-16 year old offenders that were catered for in the present study. The current study sought to understand anti-social behaviour by incorporating: statistical analysis of existing records, observations and interviews. The current study was concerned with: 1) what types of anti-social behaviour were occurring on buses, 2) when this behaviour occurred, 3) who was committing it and 4) what could be done about it?

The fourth question mentioned was really geared towards preventative measures and a real strength of the current study was the opportunity to work with the Dublin Bus *Zero Tolerance Unit*. For the purpose of this study the brief of the *Zero Tolerance Unit* as stated by Kelly (2007) (in charge of the unit) was to: “ensure all passengers are in possession of a valid ticket and that no unruly behaviour is occurring on the bus”. These individuals check approximately 170/180 buses every week. Their experience in dealing with perpetrators of anti-social acts and of the incidents themselves provided an invaluable insight into the nature of anti-social behaviour on buses and how it is *policed*.

The findings were discussed in light of other research noted in the literature review and recommendations formulated. For example the statistical findings could provide some interesting cultural insights if compared to the statistics of other jurisdictions (see European Conference of Ministers of Transport, 2003). Other avenues were suggested for academic research, for example: specialised public attitudinal surveys towards the *Zero Tolerance Model* in this country and how it would influence their usage of public transport (see Donohue, 1997).

RATIONALE SECTION

In the introduction an overview of the research topic was given and a breakdown of the study. Having given an overview of the research topic, the main question that arises is: is this research topic (examining anti-social behaviour on buses) justified? To answer this question, public transport and its importance in society must be conceptualised. Following on from this, how does anti-social behaviour directly affect passenger behaviour towards public transport? And what constitutes anti-social behaviour?

Benefits Of Transportation

From the beginning of civilization, the man is living in settlements which existed near banks of major river junctions, a port, or an intersection of trade routes. Cities like New York, Mumbai and Moscow are good examples (Mathew and Krishna Rao, 2007).

The reason for this is that transportation is of paramount importance to any society. Transportation is closely aligned to: the style of life, range of activities, and the services available to the people that live there (Mathew and Krishna Rao, 2007).

In the United States the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) claim that about 33 million trips are taken each weekday (APTA, 2008). The main benefits they note for public transport over a large number of people using cars are quite varied, ranging from economic benefits to social advantages and even environmental pluses. According to the APTA (2008) public transport: eases traffic congestion, creates and sustains jobs, provides access to jobs, increases real estate values, fosters more liveable communities, provides mobility for senior citizens, provides access for rural areas, improves air quality and enhances mobility during emergencies.

In Ireland, under the National Development Plan (Transport 21) the Government have decided to spend €34 billion between 2006 and 2015 to try and deliver a world-class transport system (Transport21, 2008). So clearly the Irish economy must be heavily reliant on transportation to justify such expenditure.

Transportation Usage

The main reasons people utilise public transport are: 54% use it to get to and from work; 15% to get to and from school, 9% to go shopping (APTA, 2008). In the United Kingdom, the Department of Transport (2004) note that among

young people and adults the bus is the most common form of public transport. 46% of women and 40% of men use the bus on at least three of four occasions each week (Department of Transport, 2004).

In Ireland, The Dublin Bus fleet of over one thousand buses and 2,800 drivers carries almost 500,000 passengers everyday (Kelly, 2007). Operations go beyond the Dublin border, for example: to Meath: Dunboyne, to Wicklow: Blessington and to Kildare: Kilcock. This is symptomatic of how public transport can be an extremely important commodity in people's lives.

The decision of whether or not to use public transport is influenced by a range of factors, for example: time of journey, cost of service, accessibility and how frequently available the service is (Department of Transport and Crime Concern, 2004). Another crucial consideration for people though, is personal security. Indeed, for more vulnerable members of society, it can dissuade them from travelling altogether. For example, 48% of elderly people in Scotland have no access to a car, so they are completely reliant on public transport to get around (Scottish Executive, 2005). Due to crime many of these people choose not to travel (Parker, 1997); a major survey in Britain found that 11.5% more journeys would be made on public transport if passengers felt they were more secure (Department of Transport, 2004).

This problem of passengers not using public transport due to anti-social behaviour could involve even greater numbers than official statistics illustrate due to under-reporting. The British Crime Survey (Home Office, 2002) found that 80% of respondents had not reported the last incident of: harassment, physical assault or violence that they had encountered on public transport.

What Is Anti-Social Behaviour?

So criminal behaviour has a negative impact on the transportation industry (that is crucial to society) and people's: enjoyment/likelihood to use public transport. The nature of anti-social behaviour can be diverse as the National Crime Council (2003) report on Public Order in Ireland demonstrated. The Criminal Justice (Public Order) Act 1994 listed a range of behaviours defined as prosecutable. These offences were: 1) intoxication in a public place, 2) threatening, abusive or insulting behaviour in a public place, 3) disorderly conduct in a public place, 4) failure to comply with a member of An Garda Síochána, 5) entering a building with an intent to commit an offence and 6) failure to surrender

intoxicating liquor. So in Ireland any of the offences listed above can be defined as anti-social behaviour; if they occur in a public place. The Criminal Justice (Public Order) Act 1994 lists a public place as including:

“any highway; any outdoor area to which members of the public have access and which is used for public recreational purposes; any cemetery or churchyard; any premises or other places to which members of the public have access or any train, vessel or vehicle used for the carriage of persons for reward” (cited in National Crime Council, 2003: 11).

Thus a bus certainly qualifies. However anti-social behaviour on buses has not received much attention in Ireland or indeed in the academic community. Most research has been undertaken in government transport reports or bus companies' documentation. Next in the literature review the different components of anti-social behaviour on public transport (specifically buses) will be broken down and what academic sources have to say on the issue shall be examined.

LITERATURE REVIEW SECTION

Having given an overview of the seriousness of anti-social behaviour in general, the next stage is to examine its components. The literature review has been broken down into certain distinct categories. The comprised categories are: anti-social behaviour on buses, the nature of crime and disorder on buses, the criminological relevance (includes fear of crime and broken windows theory), spatial issues, a profile of offenders involved in anti-social behaviour, preventative measures to anti-social behaviour on buses, responses to anti-social behaviour on buses and zero-tolerance policy towards anti-social behaviour on buses.

Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses

Anti-social behaviour is defined as behaviour that threatens the physical or mental health, safety or security of individuals or causes offence or annoyance to individuals (Scottish Executive, 2005: Annex 1).

In 2005 the Scottish Executive published a document entitled: “Anti-social Behaviour on Buses”, they conducted a representative sample of 600 interviews across Scotland among adults aged 16 years and over. 66% of respondents referred to verbal abuse as constituting anti-social behaviour on a bus while 45% cited drunken behaviour. In total 12 different types of offence were identified ranging from minor (graffiti) to severe (physical assault of passengers) in nature, consequently these standardised offences form the basis of what is meant by anti-social behaviour on buses. The other categories were: being rude/verbal abuse, drunken behaviour, smoking cigarettes on buses, physical assault of drivers, threatening behaviour in large groups at bus stops, dumping litter/rubbish, throwing objects at bus and deliberate damage to bus (Scottish Executive, 2005).

The study yielded some interesting results when examining passenger's attitudes as to what form of anti-social behaviour on buses they felt to be of most concern. Dumping of litter and taking illegal drugs were deemed to be equally problematic on the scale (16%). The throwing of objects at the bus (26%) was deemed to be of far greater concern than people throwing objects in the bus (7%). In the main, passengers seem to echo the view that behaviour that directly impinges on them (e.g. threatening behaviour in large groups at bus stops, 32%) is of greater concern than more isolated anti-social behaviour (smoking cigarettes on buses, 18%). This highlights how some less serious offences (such as being

rude/verbal abuse) can affect passenger's satisfaction with the bus service more than some offences commonly viewed as being more serious for example taking illegal drugs.

So analysis is needed to appease the aims of crime control and how it identifies the problems and fears experienced by citizens (or in the case of public transport: customers) for common remedies.

Nature Of Crime/Disorder On Buses

Pearlstein and Waches (1982) state that crime levels are highest on routes traversing high crime areas. A survey of incidents on buses in the UK found that levels of assault were highest in Metropolitan areas (Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research, 1997). In Ireland this would stand to reason as the most troublesome areas tend to be heavily populated (Kelly, 2007). The Evening Herald (2006) noted that some: 'Dublin bus drivers are refusing to work in some parts of Finglas...because of a spate of anti-social behaviour'. Some bus routes have been temporarily removed or curtailed in Dublin as a direct of anti-social behaviour (primarily stone throwing) (Kelly, 2007).

On the issue of troublesome crime and potential measures on buses Feltes (2002) claims that *Dublin* provided some key insights into the dynamics of the problem. Graffiti was deemed to be an ongoing problem, which was more prevalent in socio-economically deprived areas. In relation to vandalism *Dublin* noted how it occurs both inside and outside the bus. Inside the bus vandalism usually constitutes: tearing the cushions of seats with knives, interfering with light shades and kicking windows. Outside the bus the main problem is stone-throwing, leading to broken windows or panel damage (Feltes, 2002).

Criminological Relevance (Fear Of Crime/Broken Windows Theory)

Fear of crime is accentuated by anti-social behaviour and differing levels of fear are experienced by different groups of the population (National Crime Council, 2007/8). The problem is that fear of crime often does not correlate with rates of victimisation. Furthermore mistaken knowledge on the part of the general public can lead to a perception that crime is rife. A Japanese survey discovered that over 50% of residents reported a fear of being a victim of burglary; this is despite the reality that the chance of them actually being victimised in this way was 1% (Ito, 1993).

When this phenomenon is examined in relation to disorder on public transport again the fear of crime numbers are disproportionately higher than the recorded incidents of crime. When these figures are compared to statistics of people who have experienced crime on public transport at some stage, the differences are apparent. Crime Concern (1997) claim only 5% of passengers report having been threatened with violence. A relatively small figure of 4% of passengers reported being the victim of theft. Most interestingly 11% of passengers report being stared at in a hostile or threatening way. This data illustrates the variety of ways anti-social behaviour can be witnessed on buses (Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research, 1997).

Women's fear of crime (44%) is seen to be greater than men's (19%) when waiting at a bus stop. This extends to 47% of women and 21% of men feeling unsafe walking from the bus stop to their destination (Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research, 1997). Males are found to be 2 to 3 times more likely to be victims of: physical assault or robbery (Department of Transport and Crime Concern, 2004). Women though are four times more likely to experience sexual assault (Department of Transport and Crime Concern, 2004).

The Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research (1997) shows that women's fear is greater than men's, thus women are probably more likely to avoid using public transport as a result. People from minority ethnic communities and elderly people also tend to convey more fears for their personal safety. One practical way that this can be seen is in the fact that ethnic minorities are more likely to sit downstairs on a bus, where the driver is present (Scottish Executive, 2005).

It is difficult to fathom what approach to managing crime levels will lead to the greatest feelings of public safety as the public's views are constantly changing with respect to different crimes and how they should be dealt with (Van Swaaningen, 2005).

Some criminologists suggest that not only is fear of crime increased by anti-social behaviour; but that there may be a link between incivilities and more serious crime (Stafford, 2002). Two prime elements of anti-social behaviour are vandalism and graffiti. A government survey was conducted in Australia to see what forms of anti-social behaviour people commonly engaged in. The results demonstrated a propensity to engage in both less serious crime like: shoplifting

(29.7%) and applying graffiti (22.9%); along with more serious crime such as: taking part in a riot/fight (18.3%) (Halsey and Alison, 2006). This suggests a strong correlation between engaging in different types of apparently unrelated crimes on the part of offenders (Halsey and Alison, 2006).

Under *broken windows* theory smaller indiscretions can manifest into even more extreme anti-social behaviour (McCabe, 2008; McLaughlin and Muncie, 2005). At a basic level failure to remove graffiti will at the very least lead to the occurrence of more graffiti (Whitford, 1992). *Broken windows* theory states that if a window is left broken then others will be broken in retaliation to a *no one cares* scenario. The public perceive crime in the area to be escalating, so people become fearful and go out in public less often. With less people in public spaces there is a break down in conditioned etiquette responses; therefore the area is more vulnerable and crime will indeed increase (McLaughlin, Muncie and Hughes, 2003). Stafford (2002: 105) addresses this issue from the passenger's perspective: if vandalism or graffiti could: 'be produced without disruption or interruption, then other undesirable events could also take place without attention'.

Spatial Issues

Feltes (2002) noted that crime on buses was not just limited to what occurs on the bus. According to the Department of Transport (2003a) bus-related crime encompasses: the walking environment to the destination bus stop and from the arrival bus stop to where the passenger is headed, the time spent waiting at the bus stop and the on-bus journey itself. As considered earlier, threatening behaviour in large groups at bus stops was noteworthy among passenger's fear of crime reporting (32%, Scottish Executive, 2005). In terms of the journey to and from bus stops, this does raise the question about spatial policing within society and appropriate discourses and practices of surveillance within ordering practices (Coleman, 2005).

Profile Of Offenders Involved In Anti-Social Behaviour

Most bus drivers claim that, up until a few years ago, anti-social behaviour was associated mainly with young males aged between 12 and 16 years. The exception to this general rule occurred on late night buses. Drivers commonly received verbal abuse from individuals of all ages under the influence of alcohol (Scottish Executive, 2005). However, there exists a perception among drivers that

this has been broadening out in recent years, in terms of the age range and gender of those committing anti-social behaviour (Scottish Executive, 2005).

The bus driver's view seems to mirror that of the general public. Their perception is that the problem of anti-social behaviour on buses is increasing. A major bus operator in the United Kingdom also identifies young males between the ages of 12 and 16 as being the main culprits in performing anti-social behaviour on buses (Stafford, 2002). In keeping with other research on the night-time economy, Lovatt and O'Connor (1995) found that it is when schools start back after the summer holidays and the evenings are darker that the main problems occur. The journey home from school (post 16:30) is when damage is likely to be caused, for example the throwing of *missiles* at windows (Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research, 1997). Recurring anxieties in the media surrounding youths and young adults at play has often entered the realms of a moral panic (Measham and Brain, 2005).

The second group of individuals contributing to levels of fear is also linked to the night-time economy. The behaviour of intoxicated individuals is viewed to be erratic and unpredictable, and hence potentially violent (Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research, 1997; Finney, 2004). For a long time the British *binge and brawl* pattern of alcohol-based weekend leisure has been prevalent (Measham and Brain, 2005). In Dublin problems related to alcohol consumption tend to be the main problem for Night-link services (Kelly, 2007).

It should be noted here that while anti-social behaviour may be highest between 3-7pm, it would also coincide with the highest volume of passenger numbers (Department of Transport, 1998). The Scottish Executive (2005) highlight that those aged 12-14 years are most likely to experience anti-social behaviour between 2:01pm and 4:00pm (the time they would be leaving school), with 25-39 year olds having higher than average mentions of incidents occurring between 4:01pm and 6:00pm (the time they would be leaving work). This suggests that people will report crime on buses as being worst at the times they experience bus travel most commonly. Significantly in the Scottish Executive (2005) study, bus drivers (without exception) commented on experiencing anti-social behaviour on school runs. Since bus drivers work all times of the day, this would suggest that school runs are probably highly problematic for them in terms of anti-social behaviour.

Research has shown that travel habits developed at a young age can influence subsequent behaviour (Goodwin, 1983). Therefore if troublesome areas are acknowledged then through proper intervention (containment strategies), perhaps the problems in these areas can be reduced (see UITP Commission On Transport & Urban Life, 2004).

Preventative Measures To Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses

Feltes (2002) contacted the transport authorities in 29 major European cities to garner information on security in relation to public transport. Preventative measures in the cities varied from increasing inspector presence on buses to the use of digital technology (video surveillance and electronic monitoring).

The feedback obtained from *Dublin* noted that the presence of an inspector (in contact with An Garda Síochána) helps to ensure a rapid response to any potential call for assistance from the bus driver (Feltes, 2002). Some bus windows are fitted with a plastic film to help guard against stone-throwing incidents causing personal injury (Feltes, 2002). Other preventative initiatives employed by Dublin Bus include: protective bus driver screens (introduced in 1995) and the procedural change that drivers no longer handle cash (Kelly, 2007).

€2.5 million has been spent on fitting the 1,000-bus fleet with 9 digital security cameras per bus. It should be noted here that Coleman (2005) adopts the view that in order to maximise spatial security bus stops should be fitted with surveillance technologies (they are not currently). And finally, various security agreements have been drawn up between: Dublin Bus, An Garda Síochána, local resident groups and the workers unions (NBRU and SIPTU)(Kelly, 2007).

International approaches to preventing anti-social behaviour on buses have been diverse and widespread. In Rome, the public transport agency (ATAC) has developed a special microfilm that is applied to the carriages and walls of the bus. This makes a whole variety of paints used for graffiti easily washable, making cleaning procedures: easier, quicker and cheaper (Rome Mobility Agency, 2001).

In Stockholm, *Calm Streets* use unemployed young people to patrol the transport network. Their role is to assist passengers and enhance feelings of safety but not to apprehend deviant individuals (Crime Concern, 2003). In Melbourne, Australia, the local government has introduced *roving safety officers* on public transport. These officers work mainly after dark to ensure that people can travel

in safety. Police statistics have shown a 12.9% drop in crime in and around public transport for the first eight months of 2004 compared to 2003 (Department of Infrastructure, 2004).

Responses To Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses

A Boot camp is run in Texas for individuals responsible for graffiti in the area (Jacksonville Daily Progress, 2003). Vandals are made to go out and clean up the damage they have caused; while under supervision. The boot camp has now been in operation for four years, and anecdotal findings suggest that levels of graffiti have decreased as a direct result of this initiative (Jacksonville Daily Progress, 2003). This approach relates to Wilson and Kelling's (1982) *broken windows* theory in that it is about building up respect amongst the inhabitants for their community. If no respect in the community is displayed by anyone then offenders are more likely to behave in an anti-social manner.

The HALT bureau in the Netherlands confront young people (aged 12-18 years) with the consequences of their actions and makes them repair/pay for the damage they have caused (without them acquiring a criminal record). The young people must also attend educational sessions that address the causes of the offending behaviour. Research indicated that only between 11% and 20% re-offended during the following 18 months (Crime Concern, 2003). This approach is very much based on restorative justice principles as espoused by Zedner (2004), which offers reparation between the offender and the victim/community.

Dublin Bus also attempts to reach out to potential offenders through education and community involvement. Bus drivers and inspectors visit schools to speak about the consequences of anti-social behaviour on the community. One senior source in Dublin Bus divulged that the company sponsored a boxing gym. This was a way of reaching out to an area that had a history of eliciting anti-social behaviour towards buses. As demonstrated by Hughes and Rowe (2007) (through neighbourhood policing and crime reduction partnerships), if the company can be seen as a positive influence then this is preferable to being viewed as an antagonistic authoritarian presence (Goodwin, 1983).

Zero-Tolerance Policy Towards Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses

Bowling (1999) postulates that *Zero-Tolerance Policy* equates to: 'the aggressive enforcement of minor offences' (1999: 531).

Dublin Bus established the *Zero-Tolerance Unit* two years ago to: control fare evasion primarily and deal with anti-social behaviour as it occurs (Kelly, 2007). This measure is said to have produced positive results but has not been formally evaluated.

Zero-Tolerance Policy was first adopted in New York City. Urban authorities had begun to pay more attention to public security and the public's *subjective sense of security* (McCabe, 2008). Bratton (New York chief of police) took the *Zero-Tolerance Strategy* from the field of public transport (the metro) (Barry and Connelly, 1999). The *New York Model* of crime control showed that recorded criminality fell and most natives/visitors reported feeling safer in the city (Barry and Connelly, 1999). *Zero-Tolerance Policy* proved to be very popular politically because it: increased accountability, set public targets and utilised the media as a public relations tool (Newburn and Jones, 2007). Conversely, this viewpoint has been tempered by critics of *Zero-Tolerance Policy* (mainly academic criminologists). Critics maintain that rather than reduce crime, *Zero-Tolerance Policy* simply relocates it (Bowling, 1999; Harcourt, 2001).

A recent study into the *Zero Tolerance Policy* approach towards *broken windows* theory has been conducted. McCabe (2008) evaluated the system in New York City from 1995 to 2001. In examining the relationship between serious crime, (the variable used was drug arrests), and nuisance abatement seizures, McCabe (2008) had some interesting findings. It was found that the use of serious narcotics tended to coincide with increased crime levels. This has huge implications in connection with anti-social behaviour on Dublin Bus where: smoking, alcohol and illegal narcotics can be involved. Drug use itself may induce anti-social behaviour, such as an indifference to risk and a: 'willingness to deviate from social norms' (Boyum and Kleiman, 1995:301). This study by McCabe (2008) proclaims that the rate of controlled substance arrest is directly related to crime rate; and since *Zero Tolerance Strategy* lowered the crime rate, it was deemed a successful policing strategy.

This literature review has broken the phenomenon of anti-social behaviour down into the key components of: what, who, when and why? What form of anti-social behaviour is typically occurring? Who is performing it? When is it occurring? Why are the preventive measures effective or ineffective? These ideals are crucial to the rationale underlying the methodology section that follows.

METHODOLOGY SECTION

Aim Of The Study

The aim of the study is to explore anti-social behaviour on buses in Dublin. Specifically, the research questions are focussed around four key areas:

- What is the nature of anti-social behaviour on buses?
- When does anti-social behaviour on buses most commonly occur?
- Establishing a typical profile of an individual most likely to perform anti-social behaviour on a bus.
- Are the preventative measures being employed effective and could they be improved?

The first research question hoped to establish what the most common forms of anti-social behaviours are and the severity of the incidents that typically occur. The next research question was concerned with the times of the: day, week or year, when anti-social behaviour occurs most frequently. Developing a profile of the type of offender most likely to commit certain anti-social behaviours was the focus of the third research question. The fourth research question attempted to look at the preventative strategies in place to see if they are deemed to be successful; and to see if any improvements could be suggested.

For the purpose of this study, the definition of anti-social behaviour used was based on the Scottish Executive (2005) description, plus an *other* category. Anti-social behaviour thus constitutes the following: physical assault of drivers, physical assault of passengers, being rude/verbal abuse, drunken behaviour, threatening behaviour in large groups at bus stops, throwing objects at bus, deliberate damage to bus (vandalism), smoking cigarettes on buses, dumping litter/rubbish, taking illegal drugs, graffiti and throwing objects in bus (Scottish Executive, 2005). In the current study incidents of anti-social behaviour were classified as either: minor, moderate or severe in nature.

A multi-method exploratory approach was utilised. This triangulating approach consisted of: observation, interviews and analysis of primary official data. This hybrid design was based around both quantitative and qualitative techniques. This approach (incorporating systematic observation and semi-structured interviews) yielded the highest quantity of raw data and thus allowed for the most potential inferences to be drawn (Cook and Campbell, 1979; Judd and Kenny, 1981).

Data Collection Methods

There were three main data collection methods in the research: examining official records, observation and interviews.

Table 1: Breakdown of The Raw Data.

Data Collection Methods:	Quantity:
Official Records	350
Observations	51
Interviews	4

Existing Official statistics

The first stage was quantitative in nature and involved the statistical analysis of existing primary data about anti-social behaviour on Dublin Bus. Dublin Bus does not have a centralised system for gathering statistics, but rather data are gathered at each of the seven company depots in Dublin. Following discussion with senior personnel in Dublin Bus, three routes were proposed. These routes encompassed comparable operating figures and a geographic spread. The routes chosen were: the 78A, the 77 and the 46A.

Table 2: Breakdown of The Bus Routes.

Route:	Departs City Centre From:	Arrives Suburb Terminus:	Via:
78A	Aston Quay	Liffey Valley Shopping Centre	Inchicore, Ballyfermot
77	Grand Canal Dock	Jobstown	Crumlin, Tallaght
46A	Mountjoy Square	Dun Laoghaire	Donnybrook, Stillorgan

The 78A and the 77 were identified as being problematic on the basis of the statistics held by Dublin Bus and the views of senior staff. The 46A was selected as a control because of its low level of recorded anti-social behaviour.

Once the three routes had been selected then the official statistics were obtained. The procedure in depots is for anti-social incidents to be handwritten in a logbook (after the driver reports them) and then subsequently transferred to electronic databases. Official statistics were obtained from computer records of criminality for the 78A and the 77. However, official records were not formally held for the 46A route. This in itself may be indicative of the low levels of anti-social behaviour on this route. Accordingly the researcher obtained the data by

hand from the incident logbook. The information was stamped and verified by senior personnel to insure authenticity.

The official statistics for all three routes were comprised of anti-social incidents that had occurred on buses between the 1st of January 2007 and the 30th of April 2008. In the official incident logbook for the 46A both accidents and anti-social behaviour are logged together. Incidents that were not of an anti-social nature were discarded, for example a road traffic accident.

Observation

The second stage of data collection was qualitative in nature and involved the observation of the selected bus routes. The researcher travelled on each route over a period of three weeks (the month of May was selected so that school children and young people would be present on each route). Each route was given equal weighting with regard to: time spent on the route, time of the day travelled on the route and amount of time spent on upper/lower decks.

The passengers on an inbound (towards city centre) route were observed each morning at approximately 08:00 hours (when people would be going to work or school). Then the passengers of an outbound route were observed around 16:00 hours (when people would be returning home). This occurred from Monday to Friday on each route culminating in a total of three weeks observation. The observer sat on the top deck for four of the five days because the majority of anti-social incidents are alleged by senior staff to occur on the top deck, but time was also needed on the bottom deck to clarify this perception.

Throughout the observation stage the researcher kept contemporaneous notes. Data was recorded on a chart (see appendix A) with respect to: driver details, amount of people on the bus, age profile, gender, ethnicity, the anti-social incident that occurred, time of incident and the location of the incident. Incidents witnessed by the researcher happening outside the confines of the bus were also noted. An example of this was graffiti occurring at a bus stop.

The reason for the observation stage was to see if there was a bias towards the reporting of more serious types of anti-social behaviour in the official statistics (stage one)(Bland and Read, 2000).

Interviews

The third stage of the research involved semi-structured interviews with the Dublin Bus *Zero Tolerance Unit* (a checking unit). A member of the unit

surmises their role as being: “responsible for all ticket checking...making sure people are paying the correct fare,...And also making sure people are not breaching other bye-laws, for example: like drinking on a bus and smoking” (interview 1).

A convenience sample of four participants was selected, due to there being limited numbers in the unit. Each of the four interviews lasted 15 minutes. The information gathered about the type of incidents occurring in stage one were utilised in drawing up appropriate questions for the interviews (see sample questions, appendix B).

The purpose of the interviews was to supplement and verify the data gathered in stage one and stage two. The interviews were held with the inspectors who are directly responsible for implementing policing strategies on buses. Since these interviewees had a lot of expertise in the area of anti-social behaviour on buses, it was hoped new suggestions to tackling the problem of anti-social behaviour might be forthcoming.

Analysis

The data collection methods yielded a lot of raw data. In stage one 350 cases of anti-social incidents were contained in the official records. There were 64 observations in stage two, 51 involved some form of anti-social behaviour occurring, while in 13 cases the whole bus journey passed off without incident. Only the 51 cases where an anti-social incident had occurred were included in the statistical tests to make the data comparable to the official statistics. From stage three there were the four interviews.

The data gathered in stage one and two were analysed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 16, to compare for: patterns, discrepancies and correlations. The statistical tests conducted included: frequencies, cross tabulations and descriptive statistics.

All observational data gathered in stage two was included in the analysis. Common themes emerged from the detailed notes of the observations. The interviews were transcribed and analysed identifying common themes and synergies. The data gathered from stages one and two were examined to see if they yielded information similar to the views of the *Zero Tolerance Unit* interviewees, who witness anti-social occurrences on a daily basis.

Access, Consent And Ethical Considerations

An initial meeting took place with a senior manager at Dublin Bus who granted access to the depots and the *Zero Tolerance Unit*. Access to the three main gatekeepers in the three depots (Conyngham Road, Ringsend and Donnybrook) was granted and informal interviews were arranged to access the data. Each gatekeeper provided all the statistics on anti-social behaviour available in their depots.

Written consent for the electronic audio recording of interviews was obtained prior to the commencement of each interview (see appendix C). This was under the provision that all information provided by the interviewees would remain anonymous. Accordingly, information divulged through the course of each interview that related to the interviewee's identity (for example time spent in the company) was deliberately omitted from the transcripts (see appendix D).

The researcher's own occupation in Dublin Bus did not present any ethical dilemmas for the research since the researcher was not answerable to anyone connected with the study, minimizing the likelihood of researcher bias. However, this connection allowed access to records not normally forthcoming to the civilian population.

Limitations Of The Methodology

It was envisioned that the interviews with the *Zero Tolerance Unit* would have been of greater duration than 15 minutes; however, this was not possible due to time restraints and the busy schedule of these individuals. Furthermore official Dublin Bus statistics as to the performance of these individuals was not made available. While categorised official statistics on the *Zero Tolerance Unit* may not be held, incident reports into cases would probably have to be logged

The main drawback of the methodology was the result of coding a research variable inappropriately. The problem was in the coding of the variable: age profile. Prior to the observation stage, it was deemed most scientifically rigorous to have an equal weighting in duration of years for each category. The categories for this variable were: 0-12, 13-24, 25-36, 37-48, 49-60 and 60+. On reflection the age brackets for the profile of an anti-social individual should have been narrower. The age profile of offenders turned out to be extremely congested between years 13-24. In hindsight a narrower age bracket, for example 13-18 and 19-24 would have been more appropriate.

Another limitation of the study was the small sample size of the observational statistics ($n=51$); as a result caution must be exercised as to the reliability and validity of some results.

FINDINGS SECTION

The 401 anti-social incidents were analyzed through SPSS with a breakdown as follows: 350 cases comprised the Dublin Bus official statistics (stage 1) and 51 cases made up the observation phase of the current study (stage 2). The breakdown by route was: 235 cases (78A), 142 cases (77) and 37 cases (46A). All 401 cases were used for the first two research questions but only the 51 current study cases could be used on the third question. The appropriate statistical data will be presented in connection with suitable interview quotes, as per each research question. Research quotes forming the almost exclusive basis for question four; since this could not be statistically evaluated. The findings are presented around how they relate to each research question.

The Nature Of Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses

Incident Type

Table 1 (below) is comprised of the 350 official cases of anti-social incidents. The table shows the frequencies of the types of incidents occurring across the three Dublin Bus routes.

Table 1: Official Statistics For Incident Types.

Incident Type	Frequency	Percent
rude/verbal abuse	14	4.0
drunken behaviour	12	3.4
smoking	7	2.0
assault of driver	18	5.1
threatening behaviour at bus stops	4	1.1
assault of passengers	39	11.1
throwing objects at bus	50	14.3
vandalism	138	39.4
graffiti	2	.6
throwing objects in bus	14	4.0
taking illegal drugs	4	1.1
other	48	13.7
Total	350	100.0

The official statistics in table 1 (above) demonstrates that the most problematic anti-social behaviour occurring on Dublin Bus is vandalism 39.4%. Other behaviours of serious concern are: throwing objects at the bus (14.3%, primarily stones), assault of passengers (11.1%) and *other* (13.7%). In a small

number of cases offences such as theft and attempted abduction were recorded (listed in the *other* category).

When these results are compared to the types of incidents recorded in the observational statistics, the differences are apparent. Table 2 (below) shows the recorded frequencies of the types of incidents witnessed by the researcher on the three Dublin Bus routes. Although the makeup of the data is comparable to the official statistics, the small sample size numbers must be noted.

Table 2: Observational Statistics For Incident Types.

Incident Type	Frequency	Percent
rude/verbal abuse	10	19.6
drunken behaviour	3	5.9
smoking	7	13.7
threatening behaviour at bus stops	1	2.0
dumping rubbish	10	19.6
assault of passengers	2	3.9
vandalism	4	7.8
graffiti	3	5.9
throwing objects in bus	5	9.8
taking illegal drugs	3	5.9
other	3	5.9
Total	51	100.0

In the observational statistics the most frequent anti-social incidents are: dumping rubbish (19.6%; does not even appear in official statistics), rude/verbal abuse (19.6%) and smoking (13.7%). Vandalism is only at 7.8% (compared to 39.4% in the official statistics) and throwing objects at bus does not appear. This suggests that the types of incidents being recorded in the official statistics are of a more severe variety, so the incident severity will be tested.

Interview Results:

According to the interviewees the most common types of anti-social behaviour were: smoking, drinking, fare evasion and stone throwing. When asked about the most common forms of anti-social behaviour interviewee one gave the following response: “most commonly I would imagine smoking and drinking, you know... its not just cigarette smoke... Other things likely maybe hash; or unfortunately heroin” (interview 1). Another said: “well it depends now...the likes of: smoking, drinking...maybe children writing on the buses...graffiti, and

generally bad behaviour as well” (interview 3). Perhaps the most appropriate description came in interview four: “from maybe people with feet on the seats all the way up to maybe heroin being taken on buses” (interview 4).

Incident Severity

The incident types were amalgamated and categorised into a classification of: minor, moderate and severe sub groups. Types of offences classified as minor included: dumping rubbish and graffiti. Vandalism and drunken behaviour would be examples from the moderate category while assault of passengers or driver would be classified as severe incidents. The incident severity for the official statistics can be seen in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Official Statistics For Incident Severity.

Incident Severity	Frequency	Percent
minor	35	10.0
moderate	226	64.6
severe	89	25.4
Total	350	100.0

What stands out most is that moderate incidents of severity (64.6%) are the most likely to be recorded. The severe category is also higher (25.4%) than the minor category (10.0%), which is noteworthy.

Table 4 (below) lists the severity of incidents for the observational statistics.

Table 4: Observational Statistics For Incident Severity.

Incident Severity	Frequency	Percent
minor	41	80.4
moderate	9	17.6
severe	1	2.0
Total	51	100.0

In this table the vast majority of incidents are of the minor variety (80%). Moderate incidents of severity are the next most prominent grouping (17.6%), with severe incidents of severity at just 2%. This suggests a bias in the reporting of more serious incidents within the Dublin Bus official statistics.

Incident Location

The last important distinction to be made about the nature of anti-social behaviour is where does it occur? The official statistics and the observational

statistics were examined to see if they agreed as to which of the three routes (78A, 77 and 46A) was the most problematic. Table 5 (next page) shows the official statistics for: the types of incidents occurring, their severity and also the bus route they occur on.

Table 5 provides a lot of information. Firstly in terms of the ratio of incidents: 214 cases occurred on the 78A, 110 cases occurred on the 77 and just 26 cases occurred on the 46A. In terms of severity of incident the 78A route had the most severe incidents (55), followed by the 77 (110) while the 46A had the least (7). Proportionally the 46A had the most minor incidents of the three routes and a number of offences are not even listed as occurring (for example taking illegal drugs). The 77 route falls in between the other two routes, not as much anti-social behaviour as the 78A but more than the 46A.

<i>Table 5: Official Statistics By Route.</i>		Incident Severity			Total
Route	Incident	minor	moderate	severe	
78a	rude/verbal abuse	9	1	0	10
	drunken behaviour	1	8	2	11
	smoking	5	0	0	5
	assault of driver	0	1	8	9
	threatening behaviour at bus stops	0	1	1	2
	assault of passengers	0	0	26	26
	throwing objects at bus	1	8	5	14
	vandalism	0	108	2	110
	throwing objects in bus	2	2	0	4
	taking illegal drugs	0	2	0	2
	other	4	6	11	21
Total		22	137	55	214
77	rude/verbal abuse	4	0	0	4
	drunken behaviour	0	1	0	1
	smoking	1	0	0	1
	assault of driver	0	1	7	8
	threatening behaviour at bus stops	0	0	2	2
	assault of passengers	0	2	9	11
	throwing objects at bus	0	34	2	36
	vandalism	0	21	1	22
	graffiti	1	0	0	1
	throwing objects in bus	0	6	1	7
	taking illegal drugs	0	2	0	2
	other	1	9	5	15
Total		7	76	27	110
46a	smoking	1	0	0	1
	assault of driver	0	0	1	1
	assault of passengers	0	0	2	2
	vandalism	1	5	0	6
	graffiti	1	0	0	1
	throwing objects in bus	0	3	0	3
	other	3	5	4	12
Total		6	13	7	26

Table 6 (below) gives the equivalent information for the observational statistics regarding: the types of incidents occurring, their severity and also the bus route they occur on.

<i>Table 6: Observational Statistics By Route.</i>			Incident Severity			Total
Route	Incident		minor	moderate	severe	
78a		rude/verbal abuse	2	1	0	3
		drunken behaviour	2	1	0	3
		smoking	2	0	0	2
		threatening behaviour at bus stops	1	0	0	1
		dumping rubbish	4	0	0	4
		vandalism	1	0	0	1
		graffiti	1	0	0	1
		taking illegal drugs	0	1	0	1
		other	1	0	1	2
	Total		14	3	1	18
77		rude/verbal abuse	6	1		7
		smoking	5	0		5
		dumping rubbish	4	0		4
		assault of passengers	0	2		2
		vandalism	3	0		3
		graffiti	2	0		2
		throwing objects in bus	5	0		5
		taking illegal drugs	0	2		2
		other	0	1		1
	Total		25	6		31
46a		dumping rubbish	2			2
	Total		2			2

From table 6 it is apparent that the 46A does indeed have very few anti-social incidents occurring on it, just 2 minor incidents were noted throughout the total observations conducted. This is in keeping with the official statistics but the 78A and 77 data are not. While this discrepancy could be down to the small sample size, the observational findings show that more incidents were noted to have occurred on the 77 route (31 incidents) than the 78A route (18). Perhaps the

one severe incident that occurred (dealing illegal narcotics) happening on the 78A is symptomatic of the likelihood to report serious behaviour on that route. While most incidents did occur on the 77 it should be noted that these were mainly of a minor nature (25 incidents).

Interview Results:

About the three bus routes that were the focus of the study (78A, 77 and 46A) all agreed that the 78A was the most problematic. Interviewee one responded: “In my opinion, hands down the worst route in the city...As an inspector or chief inspector you really wouldn’t want to be getting onto that bus on your own. The very minimum when we’re getting the zero tolerance checking there’ll be four of us” (interview 1). Further description comes from interviewee three: “I would say that it is probably from terminus to terminus. You know, you could have problems anywhere along the route” (interview 3).

The consensus among the interviewees was that the 77 route was more difficult to deal with than the 46A but not as demanding as the 78A. A key point about the 77 was made by interviewees one and three; regarding a lot of anti-social behaviour occurring between Tallaght and Jobstown but not from the city centre to Tallaght. “The reason being since the Luas [tram system] has come on stream now, a lot of people seem to travel on the Luas maybe up as far as the square” (from the city centre)(interview 1).

All four interviewees seemed to think that the 46A offered very few problems. As one respondent described when speaking about the 46A: “very little trouble. But I mean every bus has the potential to have trouble” (interview 4). The gatekeeper on the 46A maintained the low level of anti-social behaviour on this route was the result of the 46A traversing areas of high economic status.

Interviewee three recognises where the main anti-social behaviour is likely to occur: “You’ve certain estates on the 78A route and 77 route and the Ballymun routes” (interview 3).

When Does Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses Most Commonly Occur?

Table 7 (below) shows the official statistics timeline for when anti-social incidents are occurring, based on sets of 4 hour intervals.

Table 7: Official Statistics Timeline of Incidents.

Time	Frequency	Percent
6am-10am	15	4.3
10am-2pm	37	10.6
2pm-6pm	76	21.7
6pm-10pm	140	40.0
10pm-2am	82	23.4
Total	350	100.0

Table 7 (above) shows that most anti-social incidents occur between the hours of 6pm and 10pm (40.0%). Followed closely by 10pm-2am (23.4%) and 2pm-6pm (21.7%). Comparatively few incidents occur earlier in the day: 10am-2pm (10.6%) and 6am-10am (4.3%).

When these results are compared to the observational statistics the results seem fairly uniform (see table 8 below). However, it should be noted that the observation phase of the current study only featured two time slots: 6am-10am and 2pm-6pm. The results in table 8 (below) show that a lot more incidents occurred between 2-pm-6pm (74.5%) compared to just 25.5% for 6am-10am (a ratio of almost 3:1).

Table 8: Observational Statistics Timeline of Incidents.

Time	Frequency	Percent
6am-10am	13	25.5
2pm-6pm	38	74.5
Total	51	100.0

Interview Results:

When the researcher posed the question: “in terms of the behaviour. Are we talking certain times of the day as being worse than others? Or times of the week...eh...times of the year?” to interviewees, the responses were mixed. Interviewee one responded based on the 78A: “I find...most of the hassle your going to get is between 10 o’clock in the morning and 7 or 8 o’clock at night...For reason being because you have a methadone clinic up in Cherry Orchard hospital” [Problems based around opening hours] (interview 1). Interviewee one also commented on year specific issues: “Stone-throwing is always a kind of issue that seems to flare off when kids are off school...So eh summer holidays and eh mid-term breaks and that type of thing” (interview 1).

Respondent two makes the distinction between the type of anti-social behaviour occurring and the time of day:

Well roughly between 2 o'clock in the day and half 8 at night regards the smoking. Now later on in the night...particularly now when the evenings are bright at 9 o'clock at night [interview took place in August]...young fellas...with the stones and they just let it fly (interview 2).

Interviewee three makes similar but interesting points again highlighting how times of the year can instigate problems: “stone-throwing always about two weeks before Halloween it kicks in” (interview 3). Interviewee three sums up anti-social behaviour and the time of day it occurs in a way that seemed to be the consensus among the four interviewees: “All day, except maybe the early buses would be ok, you’ve a lot of workers” [on their way to jobs] (interview 3).

What Type Of Individual Is Most Likely To Perform Anti-Social Behaviour On A Bus?

The statistical analysis for the current study had 51 cases with some incidents involving more than one perpetrator. Again for this statistical data the 13 cases where no incident occurred were omitted. In order to build up a profile of an individual committing anti-social behaviour, an anti-social act must first be committed.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics For Male and Female Involvement.

Gender Involved	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
males	.00	4.00	1.1569	1.04638
females	.00	4.00	.5490	1.00625

When descriptive statistics was run on the 51 anti-social incidents the minimum and maximum numbers for male and female offenders were the same: zero min (since not involved in an anti-social act) and four (maximum). The mean for males involved was 1.1569, which suggests that in most anti-social incidents 1 male was involved. The mean for females was .5490, which suggests that in just over half of incidents 1 female was involved. The statistics show a ratio of just over two to one in likelihood of males over females, to commit anti-social acts.

Table 10: Incident Severity For Male and Female Involvement.

Gender Involved	Incident Severity			Total
	minor	moderate	severe	
Males	30	8	1	39
Females	14	1	0	15

Table 10 (above) illustrates that of the 15 anti-social incidents females were involved in; 14 of these were categorized as minor and just 1 moderate. On the other hand of the 39 anti-social incidents males were involved in: 30 were minor, 8 moderate and 1 severe. This suggests a propensity to more serious crime on the part of males.

When age profile is examined (see table 11, below) it can be seen that age bracket 13-24 years is the most likely to be involved in anti-social incidents (58.8%), followed by 25-36 (37.3%). For age profiles: 0-12 (0%) and 61+ years (0%) no offenders were involved, and for categories: 37-48 and 49-60 (both 2%) offender numbers were minimal. This shows that an age grouping of 13-36 accounts for a massive 49 of the total 51 logged incidents.

Table 11: Age Brackets Of Offender Involvement.

Age Profile	Frequency	Percent
13-24	30	58.8
25-36	19	37.3
37-48	1	2.0
49-60	1	2.0
Total	51	100.0

Interview Results:

When the researcher asked the interviewees to: “give...a profile of the types of people most likely to engage in anti-social behaviour on the buses”, the answers were rather standardised. Respondent one stated the age bracket as: “anybody from 17/18 years of age, up to kind of mid-thirties” (interview 1), interviewee two agreed with this: “Anything from 14 up to 30” (interview 2). Interviewee three was quick to emphasise the type of anti-social behaviour and how this relates to the profile: “talking...about graffiti and wrecking the bus seats... anything from maybe 13 to 16;...the smoking and drinking...from later teenage years up...could go up [to] 40’s [or] 50’s” (interview 3).

The interviewees’ views on the gender of offenders had more variation. Respondent two broke down the likelihood of an offender being female to male

as: “a ratio 1 to 10 maybe” (interview 2). Interviewee four suggested an offender ratio of: “75% would be male as oppose to 25%” [female]. The most revealing insight here was given by both interviewees one and three who noted a changing culture in that: “nowadays the girls can put it up to you just as easy as the fellas” (interview 3), but that the offenders were: “mostly males” (interview 1).

Are The Preventative Measures Being Employed Effective And Could They Be Improved?

The one statistical test that was used in connection with this question was a frequency test on the driver’s responses to the 51 anti-social incidents witnessed by the researcher in the observation phase. Table 12 (below) shows that in the vast majority of cases there was no obvious response on the part of the driver (94.1%). It should be noted here that if the driver logged an incident in the report book the researcher would have no way of knowing. In 3.9% of cases the driver issued an intercom warning about smokers being prosecuted (once in connection with cigarette smoke and once in connection with cannabis smoke). Neither seemed to have an impact as the offenders continued smoking. In 2% of cases the police were called. This was for *other* anti-social behaviour (specifically fare evasion), and in this case the offender yielded and went downstairs to pay the fare.

Table 12: Driver Response To Anti-Social Incident.

Driver response	Frequency	Percent
no obvious response	48	94.1
warning	2	3.9
police called	1	2.0
Total	51	100.0

Interview Results:

The low response rate can probably be best evaluated by a quote from interviewee four who went from being a driver to an inspector: “Oh it was an eye-opener....Certainly on a bus there was a whole lot more going on than maybe I would have been aware of” (interview 4).

To help answer the first part of this research question the researcher posed the following question to the interviewees: “would you say the problem of anti-social behaviour on Dublin Bus has improved in recent years?”. Interviewee one spoke about a bus service that was in a far worse state with regard to anti-social behaviour, with: “drivers being stabbed, held up at knife-point and all the rest”

(interview 1). Some important factors in bringing about improvements in crime levels according to interviewee one were: the autofare system (drivers no longer carry cash), protective screens for drivers (driver completely enclosed) and a clear film on windows (prevents shattering).

Interviewee two was of the opinion that anti-social behaviour had improved: “In an area lets say that was never that bad with anti-social behaviour”(interview 2), but that there was a different *mindset* evident in different areas. In some areas the interviewee noted: “their prepared to take the chance. Until their caught” (interview 2).

Interviewee three believed the implementation of cameras on buses had been a great asset for: 1) helping to apprehend offenders and 2) that they also worked extremely well as a deterrent for potential offenders towards committing any indiscretion in the first place. Interviewee four said improvements in anti-social behaviour levels were the result of having a visible presence of Gardaí and inspectors in troublesome areas.

The consensus among all four interviewees was that anti-social behaviour on buses is not as bad today as it was 5-10 years back. Still though difficulties were acknowledged and improvements suggested by the interviewees. Interviewees one and three emphasised the importance of: liaising with communities, education in schools and working closely with the Gardaí. While this already happens, it can never be done too much and as interviewee four claimed: “a visible presence” helps to bring about an affinity which: “always make a difference” (interview 4). The most innovative response came from interviewee two who suggested an automatic fine system (which exists for fare evasion) for other forms of anti-social behaviour. Anti-social acts such as: “consuming alcohol on the bus... and smoking...could...[lead the inspector to]... issue an actual fine there and then” (interview 2). The advantage here would be that: the court, the Gardaí and the inspectors would have more of their time freed up to deal with other matters. This would probably act as a good deterrent for offenders too, since the fine is automated and is a standardised amount (which it is not at present).

DISCUSSION SECTION

The findings section presented many insights into anti-social behaviour on Dublin Bus. The important categories surrounding anti-social behaviour outlined in the literature review will now be re-examined in light of the information garnered from the findings.

Criminological Relevance (Fear Of Crime/Broken Windows Theory) Revisited

According to the Scottish Executive (2005) elderly people and ethnic minorities are more concerned for their personal safety than other demographic groups. These two groups will be examined with reference to the current study and then passenger fear will be looked at to see how it influences Dublin Bus staff.

The Scottish Executive (2005) study cites the likelihood of people to sit downstairs as a practical example of passenger fear towards anti-social behaviour. In the current study the researcher did chart a propensity (through the three weeks of observations) for elderly people and ethnic minorities to be more likely to sit downstairs. This was the case on the 78A and the 77. However on the 46A the elderly people remained downstairs but the ethnic minorities were just as likely to go upstairs.

In the interviews the matter of fear of crime being greater among certain demographic groups was raised with the respondents. Interviewee one made the point that due to mobility issues elderly people would: “be inclined to stay downstairs the majority of the time anyway. You know, so that wouldn’t be an issue” [speaking about anti-social behaviour](interview 1). So perhaps in the Scottish Executive’s (2005) study mobility issues could have been a confounding variable and as a result elderly people’s fear of crime was overstated.

When it came to ethnic minorities the current study seemed to replicate the results of the Scottish Executive (2005). Interviewee three stated: “it would be very unusual now to find a foreign person now sitting up the top on the back seat of the 78A. Unless they made a mistake” (interview 3). It should also be noted that in the current study two of the anti-social incidents that occurred on the 77 were racial abuse and were placed in the *other* category (in SPSS).

A very interesting insight was provided by interviewee one when talking about fear of crime and the inspectors understanding of it. Respondent one

explained that on the 78A during part of the route some people might not be able to get on the bus due to the volume of people congregated in the lower saloon. Passengers onboard the buses tend not to go upstairs even if there is room because of perceived difficulties with unruly passengers. The crucial point made by Interviewee one was: “On a lot of other routes you may be telling people to go up the stairs. You can’t really do that on that route” (interview 1). This quote shows that the *Zero Tolerance Unit* are aware of people’s discomfort and will alter their methods in order to minimise the stress caused to the general public.

Spatial Issues Revisited

The key point made by the English Department of Transport (2003a) was that a bus journey encompassed the total journey time from leaving one’s home (for example) to reaching one’s place of work (for example), and all the bus stop waiting time/on bus journey time in between. This had major ramifications for the current study and quite a few relevant findings connected to: stone throwing, threatening behaviour at bus stops, vandalism of bus stops and surveillance emerged.

The first finding was just how big a problem stone throwing turned out to be. While it must be noted that the researcher did not witness any stone throwing incidents during the observation phase, it was a topic constantly to the forefront of the current research. Stone throwing (throwing objects at bus) comprised 14.3% of the anti-social incidents in the official Dublin Bus statistics, probably suffering from a positive statistical bias (since it effects the operational ability of the bus the driver will not miss it). This form of anti-social behaviour heavily impinged on passenger accidents in the official accident/anti-social behaviour logbook as well. The researcher noticed this when having to log the incidents for the 46A by hand. Stones thrown from outside the confines of the bus: “come in and it’s not just the window that’s going to hit you, it could be the stone...or... glass...if that got into your eye” (interview 2). In fact all of the gatekeepers and interviewees noted stone throwing as a major problem. The gatekeeper in Donnybrook informed the researcher that the number 7 bus had permanently altered its route away from Loughlinstown Park due to difficulties of this nature.

It was reported earlier that Feltes (2002) noted that bus crime does not just occur on the bus. An example of this in the current study was threatening behaviour at bus stops. Threatening behaviour at bus stops comprised 1.1% of

official statistics and 2% of observational statistics respectively, of total anti-social incidents. Many informal interviews with drivers transpired through the observational stage of research and a couple of drivers mentioned an aversion to stopping at a bus stop for large groups of youths (mainly schoolchildren). The reasons given centred on the likelihood of groups of youths to harass and mock each other in a jovial manner, the consequences of this being one youth pushing another towards the oncoming bus. The drivers suggested to the researcher that the potential risk to people's safety outweighed the need to park at the bus stop.

When the researcher was travelling the three assigned routes many vandalised bus stops were witnessed. These could not be listed in the observational statistics since the perpetrator was unknown. Equally importantly Dublin Bus is not responsible for the maintenance of bus shelters (a company called Adshel is), so no vandalism of this nature appears in the official statistics in Dublin Bus depots. These points would imply that a lot more anti-social incidents are occurring around bus shelters than this study would be aware of.

In keeping with Coleman's notion of appropriate practices of surveillance, the Dublin Bus security camera system records incidents happening outside the bus as well as inside. The gatekeeper at Conyngham Road informed the researcher that the outside camera had proved invaluable in helping to apprehend criminals, who had committed offences at bus terminuses. The gatekeeper also made the point that the Gardaí had also availed these outwardly positioned security cameras on buses, for solving crimes.

These findings are symptomatic of far more anti-social behaviour existing in reality than is likely to be reported.

Nature Of Crime/Disorder On Buses Revisited

According to the Scottish Executive (2005) both bus drivers and members of the public had felt that crime had increased in the preceding five years. One of the key recommendations of the study was that the: 'reporting of incidents by bus drivers and companies should be improved, with particular emphasis on ensuring accurate data is kept on the frequency and nature of incidents' (2005: 81). This was an area the current study sought to examine in an Irish context, where these types of statistics are maintained.

Feltes (2002) listed the cities of: *Frankfurt, Helsinki, Stockholm, Prague* and *Berlin* all responding positively towards a definite increase in crime. While

cultural differences may explain these continental cities listed, culturally Ireland and Scotland should not be too different. However the current study yielded contradictory results to the Scottish Executive. All Dublin Bus personnel that the researcher spoke to during the course of the study claimed that the level of anti-social behaviour on buses had reduced. Interviewee four had this to say: “going back to the bad years where it was such a regular occurrence with windows being smashed on buses on certain routes on a regular basis. It doesn’t happen so much now, not to the same degree” (interview 4). In terms of the official statistics of anti-social behaviour the researcher was reliably informed by the gatekeeper at the Ringsend Depot that the information provided for the current study was only a fraction of what it would have been 10 years ago.

Profile Of Offenders Involved In Anti-Social Behaviour Revisited

The notion that routes navigating through areas with high crime levels would have a greater level of bus crime (Pearlstein and Waches, 1982) was found to be correct. The literature review highlighted schoolchildren and night-time offenders as the main antagonists in this regard (Lovatt and O’Connor, 1995). The current study focused on two main attributes connected to offenders: age and gender. The high numbers of young offenders (matching the 12-16 years of age profile of the Scottish Executive [2005] study) will firstly be addressed.

The Department of Transport (2003b) found that young people in high crime areas had an active dislike of bus staff (mainly drivers). Their most relevant finding to the current study was that: ‘only 18% of those aged between 10 and 12 years describe staff as “usually helpful”, and this declines to 10% for those aged 15 and over’ (Department of Transport, 2003b: 43). These youths tended to feel justified in committing anti-social acts towards bus companies. Furthermore in the Department of Transport (2003b) study they found that bus drivers in these areas also had an active dislike of young people in these areas.

In the current study there was a notable difference with how bus drivers on the 46A route tended to interact with schoolchildren compared to how the 77 bus drivers interacted with them (for example not stopping the bus at a bus stop). Most anti-social incidents on the 77 bus route were instigated by young children in uniform (compared to older offenders on the 78A), which does lend credence to this thesis.

The other important point to note here is that while the schoolchildren were committing more offences on the 77, these incidents were of minor incident classification (for example rude/verbal abuse). Although the older offenders were committing less anti-social acts on the 78A, the offences tended to be of a higher severity (for example taking illegal drugs). Should this finding be the result of an escalation of anti-social behaviour as espoused by Goodwin (1983), then this minor anti-social behaviour by youths must be tackled to reduce more extensive anti-social behaviour occurring on buses when these offenders get older.

This ties in very closely with the next finding of the study relating to the profile of an individual involved in anti-social behaviour. The *Zero Tolerance Unit* inspectors spoke about how females nowadays were more likely to be engaged in anti-social behaviour than they had been 5-10 years ago. Perhaps it is significant then that it was found in the observational statistics that female offenders were not involved in any anti-social incidents on the 46A or 78A routes. All 15 female anti-social acts were committed on the 77 and by uniformed schoolchildren. The passengers on the 77 were of a lower age demographic than the other two routes, which suggests that young females are more likely to engage in anti-social behaviour now than they were 5-10 years ago. Conversely perhaps females as oppose to males are more likely to refrain from anti-social behaviour as they mature. The implications of this and root cause (possibly new behavioural norms?) is an area which warrants new academic research.

The second group of offenders spoken about extensively in the literature as being the cause of much anti-social behaviour (due to their erratic tendencies) were drunken individuals (Finney, 2004). While this group of offenders were not specifically examined in the current study (due to observations taking place earlier in the day); the official statistics did show that most anti-social behaviour recorded was linked to the night-time economy (40% of anti-social incidents occurring between 6pm and 10pm). Furthermore interviewee three when speaking about the 78A (which produced the most anti-social incidents in the official statistics) noted that at: “Night-time say you get a lot of young teenagers say heading home and they were all drinking and they were fighting on the buses” (interview 3).

Zero-Tolerance Policy Towards Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses

Revisited

When it comes to *policing* anti-social behaviour on buses it was found that an offender is likely to engage in more than one anti-social activity and this can often involve substance use (for example cigarettes)(in keeping with: McCabe, 2008; Halsey and Alison, 2006).

One practice of the *Zero Tolerance Unit* is to have a plain clothed inspector waiting on the bus and this person rings the other three inspectors (in a nearby car) when a passenger starts smoking. The inspector waiting on the bus is responsible for identifying the offenders when the uniformed inspectors board the bus. The offender's name and address is taken and verified in the Thom's directory, this is a completely automated process regardless of the offender involved (see appendix D, transcript 2). While this process has not been formally evaluated, anecdotally it seems to have produced positive results. Interviewee four suggests that it has met with the public's approval, based on how they had apprehended some long-term offenders: "You know they were actually appreciative" (interview 4).

Dublin Bus also appears to be confident that the *Zero Tolerance Unit* has delivered beneficial results as is evident by The Dublin People (2008) article. The Dublin People (2008) article about prevalence of anti-social behaviour on the 78A noted that the official Dublin Bus response was to: 'put in place measures to improve the situation, which included a zero tolerance unit, which is carrying out spot checks on the route'.

Another action mentioned in The Dublin People (2008) that Dublin Bus takes is to curtail services on certain route as a response to anti-social behaviour. This measure is very much of a *Zero Tolerance Policy* ideology. Interviewee one assessed this procedure: "Normally when you pull the bus out of the area for a couple of days things calm down again" (interview 1).

As to the overall effectiveness of the *Zero Tolerance Unit* the researcher was impressed with many of the practices that they implement and the feedback provided by senior Dublin Bus personnel. However without statistical evidence as to the performance of the *Zero Tolerance Unit* (which the researcher requested but the data was not forthcoming) it is impossible to fully assess the merits of the group. The researcher would suggest that this analysis be carried out in the future.

The only question that arises out of the research about a *Zero Tolerance Approach* is whether the reason crime levels are being curtailed to such an extent is the result of extreme vigilance. Consider the following quote from interviewee four:

You'd be picking up on people's body language on the bus very quick. I mean when you go upstairs you normally go to the front of the bus to check tickets. But while you're at the front your eye will keep flicking to the back...and you keep seeing cause that's generally where your problems are going to be. And you're listening and you're watching, from the body movements your going to see if anyone is coming towards me to the stairs, to get off. Is he sitting back like, is he sliding back in the chair, is he ready with an attitude. You're trying to have a look at the picture before you come across how you're going to deal with it, you know (interview 4).

This can be seen as trying to manage problems before they occur or a perception to expect anti-social behaviour even when the likelihood is none will occur. The researcher would recommend a public attitudinal survey towards *Zero Tolerance Policing* in this country, which could produce some very interesting results.

Preventative Measures And Responses To Anti-Social Behaviour On Buses Revisited

Most of the practical measures Feltes' (2002) study raised are implemented by Dublin Bus. The special microfilm applied to the carriages and walls of buses mentioned by the Rome Mobility Agency (2001) may be a good addition for Dublin Bus though. During the course of the observations the researcher noted that some buses were covered in the same graffiti for periods of days, this microfilm is suppose to make it: easier, quicker and cheaper to remove graffiti. The *Zero Tolerance Unit* introduced in 2006 appears similar to the *roving safety officers* utilised in Australia (Department of Infrastructure, 2004). Some of the responses raised in the literature review will now be looked at to consider how these may translate to an Irish context.

The *Calm Streets* programme in Sweden that uses unemployed young people to assist fellow passengers and increase feelings of safety has a potential drawback (Crime Concern, 2003). Although these individuals do not apprehend deviant individuals they could still be at risk. Should offenders become aware of

these people then they could be the victims of reprisals. As noted by the interviewees in some areas they would not travel the bus route alone.

There are other innovative responses to anti-social behaviour (utilised in other jurisdictions) that could be successful here but which Dublin Bus would not be responsible for implementing. For example, the boot camp in Texas that makes vandals clear up the damage they have caused (Jacksonville Daily Progress, 2003) and the HALT bureau in the Netherlands which confronts young people with entering a reparation programme in order to avoid a criminal record (Crime Concern, 2003). Both these programmes are utilising a restorative justice approach. Community service based correctional programmes (in relation to perpetrators of anti-social behaviour on buses) could be considered by the court system in this jurisdiction. This would be a suitable alternative to custodial sentences if it would be more beneficial: to society, Dublin Bus and the offender involved (O'Malley, 2006).

The discussion section has highlighted some of the wider implications of the current study and examined how the current research compares to existing research in the field (Maguire, Morgan and Reiner, 2002). Next in the conclusion the key findings from the study will be surmised and recommendations provided.

CONCLUSION SECTION

The most common form of anti-social behaviour recorded in the Dublin Bus official statistics was vandalism. The observational statistics found that the most common forms of anti-social behaviour on buses were: rude/verbal abuse and dumping rubbish. A bias towards the reporting of more serious forms of anti-social behaviour was found. This suggests that most of the anti-social behaviour occurring on Dublin Bus is not being recorded. This is understandable since bus drivers are the primary source in recording anti-social incidents in Dublin Bus. One of the respondents in the study highlighted how bus drivers can be unaware of a lot of the anti-social behaviour occurring on the upper saloon of the bus. It was found that there were only 3 obvious responses on the part of the driver to the 51 anti-social incidents witnessed during the course of observations. Perhaps more plain-clothes inspectors boarding bus routes could help a broader picture of anti-social behaviour on buses to emerge.

The most troublesome time of day for anti-social behaviour was found to be between 6pm and 10pm. However the level of anti-social behaviour will fluctuate based on the time of year and events taking place also. Greater research is needed to fully clarify this relationship and how other factors like the weather tie into levels of anti-social behaviour.

It was found that offenders aged between 13-24 were responsible for the vast majority of anti-social behaviour that occurs on buses (58.8%). However more serious incidents of anti-social behaviour tended to be committed by a slightly older age group 25-36 (37.3%). Should the study be replicated then narrower age groupings could help to build a more comprehensive profile of the offenders in question. It was found that while males (39 incidents) are more likely to engage in anti-social behaviour than females (15 incidents), there appears to be a worrying trend towards young females becoming more involved in anti-social behaviour today than 5-10 years ago. This was an unexpected finding and one the researcher would recommend further research in.

Preventative measures being employed today by Dublin Bus appear to have reduced crime levels compared to what they were 5-10 years ago. This is against the general trend of an increase in anti-social behaviour in many other jurisdictions in recent times (see European Conference for Ministers for Transport, 2003). Some of the measures Dublin Bus have utilised in recent times

may explain this, these include: the autofare (exact cash fare machine) system, protective driver screens, shatter resistant windows, security cameras onboard buses, school coordinators who visit schools, community meetings and working closely with An Garda Síochána. It appears to be the case that the best way of tackling anti-social behaviour on buses is through a multi-faceted approach involving many different initiatives. Although outside the confines of the current study, restorative justice approaches to dealing with offenders have produced positive results in other jurisdictions and should be adopted on a trial basis in this jurisdiction. Initiatives like Dublin Bus sponsoring a boxing club in a problematic area allows the company to be viewed in a positive light, this affinity can help to dissuade potential vandalism by offenders (Goodwin, 1983).

Through the course of the study many practices of the *Zero Tolerance Unit* were described. It was suggested that automated fines for anti-social behaviours such as: smoking and alcohol consumption could be used (as is the case for fare evasion). This practice may help to: free up court services, act as a greater deterrent to potential offenders and increase the effectiveness of inspectors. The one question mark raised by the study around *Zero Tolerance Policy* is whether it can lead to *Over Policing* in certain situations. The researcher would recommend performance-based assessment into *Zero Tolerance* practices and public attitudinal surveys into how the public perceive the *Zero Tolerance Model* (see Donohue, 1997).

The study showed that some passengers' fear of crime is greater than others, which can be seen in where some people choose to sit on the bus. Ethnic minorities and elderly people were less likely to use the upper saloon on problematic bus routes (77 and 78A). However the findings for elderly people could have been confounded due to mobility issues. Greater research around fear of crime may harness information to reduce the *intimidation* some ethnic minorities are subjected to on board buses.

To reiterate, the prevalence of anti-social behaviour on buses is greater than the official statistics would reveal (51 incidents observed through 60 terminus to terminus bus journeys). While strategies are put in place to target the more serious incidents (for example: driver assaults- protective driver screens), incidents of a less serious nature do not get the attention they deserve (under-reporting of incidents). The UK Department of Transport (2004) estimate that

11.5% more journeys would be made on public transport if passengers experienced greater security on buses (Department of Transport, 2004). As to the area of anti-social behaviour that passengers felt to be of most concern, taking illegal drugs and dumping litter were found to be equally problematic (16%)(Scottish Executive, 2005). The official statistics did not report one incident of rubbish being dumped. Small innovations like applying microfilm to walls (makes cleaning graffiti easier)(Rome Mobility Agency, 2001) will improve the public's perception of the service and under *broken windows* theory reduce the occurrence of graffiti.

REFERENCES:

- American Public Transportation Association (2008). *Public Transportation Overview*. Available 15-08-08 at:
<http://www.apta.com/research/stats/overview/overview.cfm>
- ATAC- Rome Mobility Agency (2001). Vandalism and Security in Urban Passenger Transport. In: European Conference of Ministers of Transport (2003). *Vandalism, Terrorism and Security in Urban Public Passenger Transport*. OECD Publishing.
- Barry, D. & Connelly, M. (1999). Poll in New York finds many think police are biased. In: *The New York Times*, 16.3.99.
- Bland, N. & Read, T. (2000). *Policing Anti-Social Behaviour*. Policing and Reducing Crime Unit Research, Development and Statistics Directorate. Home Office, London.
- Bowling, B. (1999). The Rise and Fall of New York Murder: Zero Tolerance or Crack's Decline. *British Journal of Criminology* 39, 531-554.
- Boyum, D., & Kleiman, M.A.R. (1995). Alcohol and other drugs . In: J. Wilson & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Crime*. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- Coleman, R. (2005). Surveillance in the city: Primary definition and urban spatial order. *Crime, Media, Culture: An International Journal*, 1 (2), 131-148.
- Cook, T.D. & Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis for Field Settings*. Rand McNally. Chicago: Illinois.
- Crime Concern/Transport and Travel Research (1997). *Perceptions of Safety from Crime on Public Transport*. For Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- Crime Concern (2003). *Graffiti and Vandalism on and Around Public Transport*. For Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. Available 29/4/08 at: <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/crime/reducinggraffiti/>
- Criminal Justice (Public Order) Act (1994). Available 3/7/08 at:
<http://acts.oireachtas.ie/print/zza2y1994.1.html#zza2y1994>
- Department of Infrastructure (2004). *Linking Victoria - A Transport System for all Victorians*. Available 30/4/08 at:
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/crime/reducinggraffiti/>
- Department of Transport, (1998). *Young People and Crime on Public Transport*. Available 27/12/07 at:
<https://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/crime/youngpeopleandcrimeonpublic3010>

- Department for Transport (2003a). *Case Study Report on Graffiti*. Available 6/5/08 at:
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/crime/reducinggraffiti/casestudyreportongraffiti?page=1>
- Department of Transport (2003b). *Links Between Bus related crimes and other crimes: a briefing paper*. Available 30/12/07 at:
<https://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/crime/youngpeopleandcrimeonpublict3010>
- Department of Transport (2004). *A Bulletin of Public Transport Statistics*. Great Britain 2003 Edition.
- Department of Transport & Crime Concern (2004). *People's Perceptions of Personal Security and Their Concerns About Crime on Public Transport*. In: Scottish Executive Social Research, (2005). *Anti-Social Behaviour on Buses*. (Ed Granville, S. & Campbell-Jack, D.). Available 13/5/08 at:
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/03/20782/53859>
- Donohue, K. (1997). *The Strategy of Zero Tolerance and Its Impact on Cities and Public Transport*, UITP Conference, Berlin.
- European Conference of Ministers of Transport (2003). *Vandalism, Terrorism and Security in Urban Public Passenger Transport*. OECD Publishing.
- Feltes, T. (2002). Hochschule für Polizei Villingen-Schwenningen Germany, In: European Conference of Ministers of Transport (2003). *Vandalism, Terrorism and Security in Urban Public Passenger Transport*. OECD Publishing.
- Finney, A. (2004). *Violence in the night-time economy: key findings from the research*. Home Office, Crown.
- Goodwin, P. (1983). *Subsidised public transport and the demand for travel: the South Yorkshire example*. Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Gower.
- Halsey, M. & Young, A. (2006). Our desires are ungovernable: writing graffiti in urban space. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10 (3), 275-306.
- Harcourt, B. (2001). *Illusion of Order: The False Promise of Broken Windows Policing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hughes, G. & Rowe, M. (2007). Neighbourhood policing and community safety: Researching the instabilities of the local governance of crime, disorder and security in contemporary UK. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 7 (4), 317-346.
- Ito, K. (1993). Research on the Fear of Crime: Perceptions and Realities of Crime in Japan. *Crime and Delinquency* 39, 835-392.

- Jacksonville Daily Progress (2003). In: *Shattering the Broken Window: Is the War on Graffiti an Extreme Makeover?* Ed Pablo, J. Available 6/5/08 at: <http://www.villagevoice.com/news/0345,178946,48536,6.html>
- Judd, C.M. & Kenny, D.A. (1981). *Estimating the Effects of Social Interventions*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge: MA.
- Kelly, M. (2007). *Interview with Dublin Bus Divisional Manager R.C.U. & Central*. Interview conducted 10-12-07 at Aras Eanna.
- Lovatt, A. & O'Connor, J. (1995). Cities and the Night-time Economy. In: *Planning Practice and Research*, 2 (10), 127-134.
- Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (2002). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. (3rd Ed.,) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mathew, T. V. & Krishna Rao, K. V. (2007). *The Role Of Transportation in Society*. Introduction to Transport Engineering. NPTEL.
- McCabe, J. E. (2008). What Works in policing?: The Relationship Between Drug Enforcement and Serious Crime. *Police Quarterly*, 11 (3), 289-314.
- McLaughlin, E., Muncie, J. & Hughes, G. (2003). *Criminological Perspectives: Essential Readings*. (2nd Ed.,) London: Sage.
- McLaughlin, E. & Muncie, J. (2005). *The Sage Dictionary of Criminology*. (2nd Ed.,) London: Sage.
- Measham, F. & Brain, K. (2005). Binge drinking, British alcohol policy and the new culture of intoxication. *Crime, Media, Culture: An International Journal*, 1(3), 262-283.
- National Crime Council (2003). *Public Order Offences in Ireland: a Report by the Institute of Criminology, Faculty of Law, University College Dublin for the National Crime Council*. Dublin: Stationary Office.
- National Crime Council (2007/8). *Fear of Crime*. Available 3/5/08 at: http://www.gov.ie/crimecouncil/about_work.html
- Newburn, T. & Jones, T. (2007). Symbolizing crime control: Reflections on Zero Tolerance. *Theoretical Criminology*, 11 (2), 221-243.
- O'Malley, T. (2006). *Sentencing Law and Practice*. (2nd Ed), Dublin: Thomson Round Hall.
- Parker, M. (1997). *Assessing the Public's Perception of Personal Security and Passenger Transport*. Conference Papers for Crime and Personal Security on Public Transport, May.

- Pearlstein & Waches (1982). In: Department of Transport (1998). *Young People and Crime on Public Transport*. Available 27/12/07 at:
<https://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/crime/youngpeopleandcrimeonpublic3010>
- Romer, D., Jamieson, K.H. (2003). Television News and the Cultivation of Fear of Crime. *Journal of Communication*, March.
- Scottish Executive Social Research (2005). *Anti-Social Behaviour on Buses*. (Ed Granville, S. & Campbell-Jack, D.). Available 13/5/08 at:
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/03/20782/53859>
- Stafford, J. (2002). Crime Concern Bristol United Kingdom. In: European Conference of Ministers of Transport (2003). *Vandalism, Terrorism and Security in Urban Public Passenger Transport*. OECD Publishing.
- The Dublin People (2008). *Bus services resume after attacks*. July 31st. Available 03-08-08 at: <http://www.dublinpeople.com/content/view/841/55/>
- The Evening Herald (2006). *Dublin Bus Withdraws Services to Finglas*. July 28th. In: Dublinblog. Available 02-01-08 at:
<http://www.dublinblog.ie/2006/07/28/dublin-bus-withdraws-services-to-parts-of-finglas/>
- The Home Office (2002). *The British Crime Survey*. In: Scottish Executive Social Research, (2005). *Anti-Social Behaviour on Buses*. (Ed Granville, S. & Campbell-Jack, D.). Available 13/5/08 at:
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/03/20782/53859>
- Transport 21 (2008). *Welcome to Transport 21*. Available 12-08-08 at:
<http://www.transport21.ie/>
- UITP Commission On Transport & Urban Life, Vienna Conference (2004). *Towards sustainable urban transport in Europe: what actions are needed?* Published 2005.
- Van Swaaningen.R. (2005). Public safety and the management of fear. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9 (3), 289-305.
- Whitford, M. J. (1992). *A Practical Guide to Graffiti Removal and Anti- Graffiti Protection*. Taylor and Francis.
- Wilson, J.Q. & Kelling, G.L. (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, 29-38.
- Zedner, L. (2004). *Criminal Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A: Anti-Social Behaviour Chart.

APPENDIX A: Anti-Social Behaviour Chart	
Date:	
Bus Route:	
Departing:	
Arriving:	
Time of Boarding:	
Time of Alighting:	
Driver Information:	
Researcher Position On Bus:	
No: of Passengers On Bus:	
Age Range/ Gender:	0-12 m__ f__ 13-24 m__ f__ 25-36 m__ f__ 37-48 m__ f__ 49-60 m__ f__ 60+ m__ f__
Incident Observed 1:	Type:
	Locale:
	Offender Profile:
	Passenger Reaction/ Driver Intervention:
Incident Observed 2:	Type:
	Locale:
	Offender Profile:
	Passenger Reaction/ Driver Intervention:
Incident Observed 3:	Type:
	Locale:
	Offender Profile:
	Passenger Reaction/ Driver Intervention:
Anti-Social Beh. Observed Outside Confines of Bus:	
General Thoughts:	

APPENDIX B: Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire.

- How long have you worked for Dublin Bus?
- How much of this time has been spent in the Zero Tolerance Unit (ZTU)?
- For someone who wouldn't be aware of the ZTU how would you describe it and your role in it?
- So the central idea of the ZTU is fare evasion; how would this tie into anti-social behaviour?
- How big a problem is anti-social behaviour on Dublin Bus? What type of anti-social behaviour would you encounter most commonly? When is it most likely to occur?
- Could you give a profile of the most common offenders of anti-social behaviour?
- What are your thoughts on anti-social behaviour on the following routes: 78A, 77, 46A?
- What affect would anti-social behaviour have on other passengers?
- Has the problem of anti-social behaviour improved in recent years? If so, what would you put this down to? What else could be done to improve the situation?
- Thank you very much for your time!

APPENDIX C: Consent Form For Interviews.

Date:_____.

I hereby certify to the electronic recording of this interview
under the provision that all information given shall remain
anonymous _____.

APPENDIX D: Zero Tolerance Unit Interview Transcripts.

Transcript 1

Researcher: So how long have you worked in Dublin Bus?

Interviewee: Just coming up to ___ years [hic no. years omitted].

Researcher: ___ years[hic no. of years omitted]. And how long have you been with the Zero Tolerance Unit (ZTU)?

Interviewee: More or less ___ years now [hic no. of years omitted]. Coming up to ___ years [hic no. of years omitted]. I was an inspector with them for ___ years [hic no. of years omitted]. ___ and a half years [hic no. of years omitted] and I've now become a chief inspector. So I kind of co-ordinate all the checking.

Researcher: For the ZTU?

Interviewee: Yeah, and I report directly to ___ [hic name omitted] so I look after everything. The: co-ordination, the checking of tickets, you know going out checking for people smoking, see what's going on, on the buses.

Researcher: How would you describe the ZTU for somebody who wouldn't be familiar with it?

Interviewee: Em, we're basically responsible for all ticket checking. You know making sure people are paying the correct fare, that type of thing. And also making sure people are not breaching other bye-laws, for example: like drinking on a bus and smoking. You know we've done a lot of work with the Gardaí. In certain areas you know, when...rougher areas for want of a better word.

Researcher: So you would see a lot of anti-social behaviour in the course of your work?

Interviewee: You would, you know. And unfortunately we need the Gardaí when we go to some of these places, because we could be on a bus and not only are they smoking but they could be smoking you know illegal substances, they could be doing other types of things on a bus. And we get on simply just to check tickets. We come across people smoking and there could be two or three or four of these guys and they'd all turn on you. You know try and intimidate you.

Researcher: What would you say are the most common kinds of anti-social behaviour?

Interviewee: Eh, most commonly I would imagine smoking and drinking, you know. Like I say in certain areas its not just cigarette smoke. Their smoking and taking other things. You know so. Other things likely maybe hash; or unfortunately heroin. Whatever else, you know.

Researcher: Yeah. What kind of areas would we be talking about as the main problem for the ZTU?

Interviewee: The main areas that we would have most hassle in would be: Ballyfermot, closely followed I think by Ballymun, you know. You've the likes of Tallaght then you know, can be hairy you know but.

Researcher: Can I throw a few areas at you and you tell me what you think?

Interviewee: You can, sure yeah.

Researcher: The 78A?

Interviewee: In my opinion, hands down the worst route in the city, you know. As an inspector or chief inspector you really wouldn't want to be getting onto that bus on your own. The very minimum when we're getting the zero tolerance checking there'll be four of us. One driving the car, following the bus. And the other three lads will board the bus. One guy will sign off the driver's wayfare

machine and get a printout. And he will usually check downstairs. While the other two lads then will usually go upstairs. Soon as the man finishes his business downstairs he will go upstairs then also. Even having three people on the bus, you can still get into situations when you may have to ground the bus and the fourth man will have to get on.

Researcher: So you could tell if a bus was likely to be trouble?

Interviewee: Yeah you get a bit of a feeling the minute you get onto the bus, you can smell the smoke. By the time your going up the stairs and you look down its normally down the back in the last two or three seats. Normally down the back, top deck down the back is normally where all the hassle your going to get comes.

Researcher: And who of the people you approach would be the most common type of people that you would have trouble with? Eh the age?

Interviewee: In the likes of Ballyfermot you could be talking anybody from 17/18 years of age, up to kind of mid-thirties.

Researcher: 17.

Interviewee: 17 maybe to mid thirties you know.

Researcher: And would they be male? Or...

Interviewee: No, unfortunately some of the females can be just as bad but I would say mostly males you know but some of the females get caught up in it as well, you know.

Researcher: Yeah. And how about the 77?

Interviewee: 77...eh going up to Tallaght not too bad really. You know when your taking that bus from town up as far as the square shopping centre its not really too bad. The reason being since the Luas has come on stream now, a lot of people seem to travel on the Luas maybe up as far as the square. So it's from the Square that they transfer then onto the 77. To bring them up around the housing estates, up around Killinarden and Jobstown. So any hassle your going to get is normally from the square up into the schemes.

Researcher: okay.

Interviewee: You know. So when we're doing the smoking checking out there, it's normally from that area, from the square. From the square up into the schemes and back down as far as the square, you know.

Researcher: I know what you mean yeah.

Interviewee: Normally you could probably get away with getting on the 77 on your own. In between the square, the Greenhills road and the city centre, you know.

Researcher: Yeah...the 46A?

Interviewee: 46A. You know. Dublin 4 it's for normal working class people, not a bother.

Researcher: Few problems?

Interviewee: You've got very few problems, you can very, very rarely. Like its...you can probably count on...I don't think I've ever come across anyone smoking. You know?

Researcher: yeah, yeah.

Interviewee: It's mostly students going out to DCU [hic...UCD] and that type of thing, you know. The most common problem you have out there is people not having a student card with their student ticket. Very, very few problems out there, no hassle at all, you know.

Researcher: Eh in terms of the behaviour. Are we talking certain times of the day as being worse than others? Or times of the week...eh...times of the year?

Interviewee: I find on the 78A most of the hassle your going to get is between 10 o'clock in the morning and 7 or 8 o'clock at night.

Researcher: ok.

Interviewee: For reason being because you have a methadone clinic up in Cherry Orchard hospital. And that opens at about 10 o'clock in the morning so they all seem to come out to get up to the methadone clinic. Get their methadone, get whatever else their getting up there.

Researcher: Okay so your saying most of the anti-social behaviour occurs after 7 or 8.

Interviewee: And 10 in the morning, up to maybe 4 or 5 in the afternoon. You have like, the clinic closes at maybe half 4 in the afternoon. So you have all the, for want of a better word, junkies. Going up, you know, that hour of the day. Who will give you the most hassle. Their using passes, social welfare passes, that they've got- stolen from other people. You know it's not theirs. We've coming across them, trying to get the pass off them. And issuing them with a standard fare. All they can think about is getting to where their getting. Getting to the methadone clinic, you know.

Researcher: What kind of eh implications would you say that anti-social behaviour has on other passengers?

Interviewee: Well I mean for buses like the 78A a lot of people won't go upstairs. It comes down through Ballyfermot, it fills up as you can imagine. Coming down through Inchicore and a lot of people trying to get on are at Tyrconnell Road and Emmet road and are having to stand downstairs. They won't go upstairs understandably because they know what's going on. You know, and you can't really blame them. On a lot of other routes you may be telling people to go up the stairs. You can't really do that on that route cause...

Researcher: Would you say elderly people or ethnic minorities would be less likely to go up?

Interviewee: Yeah. Elderly people would be inclined to stay downstairs the majority of the time anyway. You know, so that wouldn't be an issue. But I say ethnic minorities as well probably cause they would be a bit intimidated. They'd watch themselves on some of these buses you know.

Researcher: You said you started this __ years ago [hic no. of years omitted]. Did you notice any changes in the last three years?

Interviewee: No, I find, fare evasion, fare evasion has never been huge you know. Ok fare evasion is grand, I think when you look at the cigarette smoking we've got it under control everywhere except maybe for the 78A. You know, we use to do a lot of smoking up in the Finglas and Ballymun area. You can often go out there now, all day, having an undercover inspector on the bus. And come across nobody smoking.

Researcher: An undercover inspector in plain clothes?

Interviewee: Plain clothes inspector. You know we normally put two of them on the bus, you know. You know from city centre up towards Finglas, Ballyfermot, whatever the case may be. And they just sit there waiting for somebody to smoke.

Researcher: And how long has this been going on?

Interviewee: And this has been going on for now three years. Since before I got promoted I had been doing it myself. So it has been going on five/six years anyway. It has been more often now with all the laws which regards smoking in the work place, and this type of thing. I mean if nothing else we have been trying to protect the driver. I mean he's entitled to work in a non- smoking part. I mean

obviously your passengers also. So eh, I mean I do find, you know, smoking has been reduced all round the city. Apart from the 78A but the 78A is still getting a few hard jobs [hic..unruly people]. But I think, they think that there's no hope type of thing, you know. It's the...I don't want to be using the word junkies but, I mean. They've other things on their mind, smoking means nothing to them on a bus. You know?

Researcher: Absolutely. Eh...so we're saying the use of plain clothed inspectors is one improvement Dublin Bus has made in recent years. What other improvements would you say that Dublin Bus has done in recent years? Maybe, you know, around the autofare?

Interviewee: Well coming down to the drivers being stabbed, held up at knife-point and all the rest. You never know, the introduction of the autofare system has been in place for a number of years. But you know, obviously you have tourists and that kind of thing who are not happy that they have to have coins/change. But when you explain to them the reason behind it, the drivers safety and everything else, you know they might not like it but their a bit more understanding about it. But you know. I mean you have a driver now whose completely enclosed, for routes, I mean he's completely enclosed now you know so he's completely cut off.

Researcher: You know you have problems with vandalism or graffiti on a bus? Eh stone-throwing at the bus?

Interviewee: Stone-throwing is always a kind of issue that seems to flare off when kids are off school more so, you know. So eh summer holidays and eh mid-term breaks and that type of thing, you know. I mean recently eh the 78A was pulled out of Coldcut it only went as far as turning right there at Liffey Valley. Where it terminated, instead of going up and around Fonthill Road and around Neilstown. Because of the stone-throwing incidents around there. Windows being smashed, drivers being intimidated, you know. Normally when you pull the bus out of the area for a couple of days things calm down again, you know.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interviewee: I mean you have buses in Tallaght now that have clear film on all the windows. Again to stop windows shattering and coming in on top of people. I mean you can say that it's going to stop the window coming in on top of people but it's not going to stop them throwing the stones, you know. But its protecting people, it's not going to stop the stones coming in and getting on top of people.

Researcher: I mean any particular incidents, or events, eh...major incidents that you saw during the course of your job?

Interviewee: Myself and one of the other lads that you will speak to ____ [hic name omitted] were actually on a 78A one day and eh this chap boarded the bus with his girlfriend; using a pass that wasn't theirs. We tried to take the pass and just ructions just broke out. I mean he grabbed a pass and eh hands and fists were thrown and all sorts. And I mean, just hell for leather. And eventually I just had to let him off the bus, and just let him go and we got the Gardaí. Then had him arrested then on the next bus. Then the Gardaí, I mean as this row was going on the other lad on the bus had called for the Guards. And then the Guards were there very sharpish, so we followed and then we got on the next bus. And then after that we had him arrested, we had him charged for assault but it's very rare that it turns to that extreme. I mean ____ [hic no. of years omitted] years in the company and ____ and a half [hic no. of years omitted] out on the road as a inspector/chief inspector. This was the first time I was ever encountering

something violent, or turning physical so is I get another __ years [hic no. of years omitted] I'll be quite happy.

Researcher: Do you think anything else could be done to improve the situation of anti-social behaviour?

Interviewee: Oh eh, in the likes of Tallaght we work very closely with the community Gardaí, and in Ballyfermot. And I know these guys go out and in plain clothes themselves. I mean other than that and us continuing to do it, I really don't know what else can be done. You know, Dublin Bus I do believe are very active in, you know, trying to combat the revenue and the smoking. But other than continuing to go the way we go and maybe, you know, putting another few inspectors into the checking unit I really don't see what more we can do, you know.

Researcher: Eh I think that's it, thanks a million _____ [hic name omitted].

Transcript 2

Researcher: Ok so how long have you worked with Dublin Bus?

Interviewee: __ years [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: __ years [hic no. of years omitted].

Interviewee: __ years yeah [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: And how much of that has been spent in the Zero Tolerance Unit (ZTU)?

Interviewee: The last __ years [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: The last __ years [hic no. of years omitted].

Interviewee: __ years with zero tolerance yeah [hic no. of years omitted] .

Researcher: And how would you describe the ZTU for somebody who wouldn't be familiar with it?

Interviewee: It's eh, it's a checking unit with Dublin Bus. And I've been at it for the last __ [hic no. of years omitted] years, or it would have been __ years now in September [hic no. of years omitted]. Now it's to deal with statutes with checking buses or tickets.

Researcher: How many buses would you check a week?

Interviewee: Eh perhaps probably about a 170/180 buses.

Researcher: That's a lot.

Interviewee: Every week.

Researcher: So it's not just tickets you say?

Interviewee: No it's not just tickets. We do eh smoking as well.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interviewee: We do it, there would be two plain clothes men on a bus. It could be myself or else I would be in the car following the bus. So two plain clothes men on the bus. As soon as somebody lights up a cigarette they'll ring me in the car. I'll follow the bus down and pull in the bus at the next stop. And I will board the bus, in uniform. And I will wander up the stairs, of course all feet are going, the cigarettes are going everywhere. As soon as they see me coming up and down the back. But eh the two plain clothes men then will stand up on the bus and will point out the individual or individuals smoking. I'll take their names and addresses and I'll verify their names and addresses.

Researcher: How is that done?

Interviewee: In the Thom's directory. We have the Thom's directory. Now sometimes we do have the Guards with us. Doing this as well, and nine times out

of ten we'll step on the bus with the Guard. The Guard will even know them anyway. But eh we check their names and addresses anyway in the Thom's, and the next procedure then after we issue to them would be going to court. So I'll be in court then with them naturally enough. Myself and the plain clothes man. So the plain clothes man...

Researcher: How many prosecutions would there be talking about in a year?

Interviewee: I couldn't tell you now to be honest. It could be a good, a fair few. Do you know its areas mostly other than other areas smoking and anti-social behaviour on a bus.

Researcher: How would you say your job ties in with anti-social behaviour that you would encounter on a bus? You mentioned smoking...drinking?

Interviewee: Drinking is bad yeah. But eh the drinking on a bus, we have a standard fare. But we're just fare evasion. But I think it would help, rather than waste the courts time and everything else, if Dublin Bus could have a standard fare just for smoking or drinking on the bus. Do you know were we could issue an actual fine, you know if I actually see you smoking on a bus then I'll issue a fine there and then. Rather than me going to court...

Researcher: Yeah procedures.

Interviewee: Well it wouldn't be blocking up the court then as much either you know. The fact that they're dealing with a fella smoking on a bus, when there's more serious things.

Researcher: You mentioned earlier certain areas, could you give an idea of what areas would be...

Interviewee: Well I wouldn't like to mention any particular area.

Researcher: Ok, eh...

Interviewee: You know. But there would be the areas that would be worse than other areas.

Researcher: Ok, so if I mention a couple of routes to you could you give me your impressions of those routes?

Interviewee: I could yeah.

Researcher: Ok, em the 78A?

Interviewee: Would be fairly high on the list yeah. Smoking and anti-social behaviour.

Researcher: Ok, and eh the 77?

Interviewee: 77 I could say wouldn't be as bad as the 78A. But there again there would be the few ones alright.

Researcher: Would you say that there would be much difference between the type of anti-social behaviour that you would witness on those two routes?

Interviewee: Maybe, there probably would be with regards smoking. But regards damage to buses I'd say you could nearly put the two of them together, you know.

Researcher: Ok, so which route would be worse for smoking?

Interviewee: Eh I would imagine the 78A.

Researcher: The 78A. And the 46A?

Interviewee: 46A em no! Very rarely do you get anyone smoking on a 46A.

Researcher: Very few problems?

Interviewee: Very, very few. Cause eh more likely if I got on a 46A and I lit up a cigarette the passengers are going to turn on me straight away.

Researcher: Okay.

Interviewee: Do you know?

Researcher: Different mindset?

Interviewee: Yeah it's a different mindset. Exactly. That's it, yeah.

Researcher: Eh so what would you say anti-social behaviour is most likely to occur in terms of: time of day, times of the week or year?

Interviewee: Well roughly between 2 o'clock in the day and half 8 at night regards the smoking. Now later on in the night of course you'll find, particularly now when the evenings are bright now at 9 o'clock at night. It's after 9 o'clock at night then you've the young fellas hanging around behind the wall with the stones and they just let it fly. It's that now than rather, but that can happen at 7 o'clock now in the winter-time, you know what I mean?

Researcher: Yeah. But would you say that there is more problems mainly in the summer when the kids are off school or...

Interviewee: Oh it's...well I think there's more...it probably would level out, you know what I mean. Like you take now, a very bad wet night, they're not hanging around street corners as much. So your not going to have as much, you know. There's a good few of them now gone in. You know their not hanging around on the bad wet night as they would be.

Researcher: Em you mentioned stone throwing which is a subject which seems to come up a lot. How big a problem would you say that stone throwing is?

Interviewee: It would be, it would be a big problem in certain areas as well, you know. Right...it's a very serious problem really cause you know if your sitting beside a window on a bus. They come in and it's not just the window that's going to hit you, it could be the stone or whatever else came in with it as well as the window. You could have glass...or...if that got into your eye, you know.

Researcher: Right. Well in terms of other passengers, how do you think anti-social behaviour would affect them, or affect certain areas maybe? People who aren't em involved with anti-social behaviour, any thoughts?

Interviewee: Well anyone who has a right mindset at all wouldn't tolerate that, you know what I mean. Nobody would condone that, you know. If I'm sitting on the, not worried what area it's in, if stones start coming into a through a window.

Researcher: What about something not as serious say, such as smoking?

Interviewee: Drinking in the back seat of the bus upstairs. They will board the bus we'll say, two fellas we'll say, with their six pack. Now listen all of this...most of this is happening in the upper saloon down in the back of the bus. If I were a plain clothed man on a bus for smoking, there very little point in me sitting downstairs. All this is happening in the upper saloon and more than likely as far down the back of the bus as possible, you know. So they'll open up their can there and start drinking, you know. But there again if that situation is happening, I will board the bus, very similar to if I'm doing the smoking thing. And I will take the open can off them, but I cannot take the can off them if it is not opened.

Researcher: I know what you mean.

Interviewee: You know what I mean. Once it's opened he's consuming alcohol on a public service vehicle.

Researcher: How would you say the average profile of anti-social behaviour offenders will be? Would it be a certain age of person or...

Interviewee: Yeah more it less it will be yeah. Anything from 14 up to 30.

Researcher: 14 to 30.

Interviewee: 14 to 30 yeah. 14 to 40.

Researcher: Ok, and would they all be engaged in the same sorts of anti-social behaviour?

Interviewee: More than likely yeah. More than likely there will be the same problems over and over.

Researcher: And would they be predominantly male?

Interviewee: More than likely...

Researcher: More than likely. In most cases?

Interviewee: In most cases. You could put down the odd case, I'd say a ratio 1 to 10 maybe, you know? [hic...female to male]

Researcher: You say you've been doing the...sorry...the ZTU for __ years [hic no. of years omitted], have you noticed any change in anti-social behaviour in that time? Has the situation improved?

Interviewee: In an area lets say that was never that bad with anti-social behaviour, it would yeah. But then you have the other area where their prepared to take the chance. Until their caught, you know what I mean?

Researcher: Yeah.

Interviewee: Their prepared to wait until they nearly arrives on my lap. You know?

Researcher: Yeah. And do you think more could be done to improve the situation, or...? You mentioned in terms of logs or direct fined on buses.

Interviewee: That's more of a personal thing, you know what I mean. If I could get on that bus with eh what we'll call our standard fare book, for fare evasion. Which the fine is automatically, well it's 50 euro. 21 days to pay the 50 euro, or else it goes to court.

Researcher: Something similar maybe in terms of other anti-social behaviour?

Interviewee: I would, yeah. You know?

Researcher: Yeah, yeah.

Interviewee: Would help in every situation. I go to court there I could have probably: 10,15,18 people in court, for not paying their fare. Not saying if they're not prepared to pay 50 euro, for not paying their fare. There gonna have the same amount coming into court maybe for not...for actually consuming alcohol on the bus, for smoking or whatever.

Researcher: And what type of offences do you think that should relate to?

Interviewee: Well I've gone to court there with maybe 6 pages and a fine and they've paid 30 euro. Could be as high as 60 euro.

Researcher: It's not a standard amount?

Interviewee: It's not, considering the seriousness of it nowadays, you know. Just know you don't smoke and that's it.

Researcher: Em think we've covered everything there _____ [hic name omitted]. Thanks for that!

Interviewee: Happy with that?

Researcher: Yeah, yeah.

Transcript 3

Researcher: So how long have you worked in Dublin Bus?

Interviewee: Em __ years [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: __ years [hic no. of years omitted]. A long time and you've be in the Zero Tolerance Unit (ZTU)...

Interviewee: Yeah for the __ __ say [hic no. of years omitted]. For the __ __ __ [hic no. of years omitted], I was on stance before that.

Researcher: Ok, what's stance involve?

Interviewee: Em just on the street like, at the quay when the bus is coming in, you know?

Researcher: Yeah, yeah, ok. And em the ZTU, how would you describe that for somebody who wouldn't be familiar with it?

Interviewee: Well it's mainly there for protection, it's checking tickets, keeping...making sure driver's are up to standard as well, doing their jobs well, and making sure buses go on schedule- all that kind of stuff.

Researcher: Yeah, and what kind of anti-social behaviour would you witness on the buses?

Interviewee: Well it depends now, on the likes of: smoking, drinking, em maybe children writing on the buses...

Researcher: Graffiti...

Interviewee: Yeah graffiti, and generally bad behaviour as well. But not on every bus obviously but on certain routes, you know?

Researcher: Yeah. So ok, so you say certain routes, what kind of areas would you say would be bad?

Interviewee: Mainly the working class areas, not saying that all working class areas are bad but there's certain areas that would be worse than others you know. You've certain estates on the 78A route and 77 route and the Ballymun routes. That are most...not all areas everywhere, but it just certain areas that are difficult, you know?

Researcher: Ok, yeah. Well if I throw a couple of routes at you could you give me your own impressions of them?

Interviewee: Yeah, go ahead.

Researcher: The 78A, one of the ones you just mentioned...

Interviewee: Eh, major problem with say: drinking, smoking at the moment on those routes now, you know. That would probably be the top of the list now. With the smoking now, the drinking, it would be yeah.

Researcher: And would there be other bad things on this route?

Interviewee: Well it can be yeah, when I was a stance man on Aston Quay at night and I use to look after the 78A's. Night-time say you get a lot of young teenagers say heading home and they were all drinking and they were fighting on the buses. And that route I would say that it is probably from terminus to terminus. You know, you could have problems anywhere along the route. There are certain routes that you would have problems from certain areas, there are very few that you would have problems from terminus to terminus, but that would be one of them, you know. You can have as much problems in town at the terminus as you would down the other end.

Researcher: And that's going to?

Interviewee: Liffey Valley.

Researcher: Ah yeah, now the 77?

Interviewee: The 77, em well mainly I would say from the square up. The 77's would be...like any of them coming out of the schemes would be, you know...we caught a few of the smokers coming out of the schemes. They would normally come down and then jump off onto the Luas, you know so the other end of the 77 would be fairly well okay. Now in saying that we have caught them at the other end as well but there wouldn't be as much. Most of the people we would have caught would be from the Square up say. You know?

Researcher: Yeah, yeah. Fair enough. Eh, the 46A?

Interviewee: Em there wouldn't be much problems. We wouldn't really have much problems with the 46A really now. The only other route I would say maybe out that side would be maybe the 7's, Sallynoggin end of it.

Researcher: Loughlinstown?

Interviewee: Again yeah there the 7 route. And you might nearly come across a few social welfare passes.

Researcher: So maybe we're talking about certain areas on certain routes.

Interviewee: Really, yeah you are. It depends really I mean the 39's would be fairly good but yet you could still come across a few undesirables, but again there wouldn't be a huge amount of them you know.

Researcher: Em you mentioned when you use to do stance on the 78A that there were problems in the evening time. In terms of times when would...

Interviewee: I'd say all day. All day, except maybe the early buses would be ok, you've a lot of workers coming in but then once say the clinics and that open from 10 o'clock on...

Researcher: The 78A?

Interviewee: Yeah, cause see you've clinics see along the route as well. And you've also got addicts on them as well, so I'd say from 10 o'clock until half 11 at night you could have problems. You know not everyday obviously but you could have problems at any time on those.

Researcher: What about other routes in general, you know, certain times of the day that could be worse or you know, the week or year?

Interviewee: Em well say for like Halloween time, kids you know, stone-throwing always about two weeks before Halloween it kicks in. That's from experience of stance, it normally starts about two weeks before Halloween and it...you've a lot of young fellas...maybe it's the full moon or something. A few young fellas start...then you've the likes of the inter cert nights. Certain times of the year when things are on, you know.

Researcher: Yeah. Eh, could you give me a profile of the types of people most likely to engage in anti-social behaviour on the buses. Eh what age group?

Interviewee: Em, well it depends on what type of anti-social behaviour. If you're talking maybe about graffiti and wrecking the bus seats, their normally a younger group.

Researcher: Ok, what age group would we say for that?

Interviewee: I'd say young, I say anything from maybe 13 to 16. That age group you know?

Researcher: Yeah, and predominantly male?

Interviewee: Maybe. Well one day you know it was, but nowadays the girls can put it up to you just as easy as the fellas, now you know. But if you're talking about the smoking and the drinking then- again they could be teenagers. More than that, again with the smoking we've found a lot of it would be with an older age group, you know. Now we do pick obviously teenagers up as well but it would be...

Researcher: In general?

Interviewee: Well if your asking in general, it would be I would say the younger age group that would be more the graffiti and you know throwing stuff around the bus...that type of stuff. Whereas the other end would be the smoking and drinking you know?

Researcher: Yeah. Eh, in terms of the smoking and drinking what age range would you say?

Interviewee: Now I'd say from teenage years up. Now from later teenage years up now cause you wouldn't really see...

Researcher: Up to what age?

Interviewee: Ah, 70!

Researcher: It goes right up?

Interviewee: Yeah it depends, it depends really it could go up 40's 50's. It depends, obviously if a couple get on the bus and their mate gets on and he happens to be a bit older, he'll just join in with them, you know?

Researcher: Yeah, yeah.

Interviewee: So that sort of thing, you know. So obviously the senior citizens wouldn't really be...you're not going to get anybody over 65 there...

Researcher: You mentioned senior citizens there, in terms of anti-social behaviour going on on buses, what affect do you think it would have on other passengers?

Interviewee: Ah terrible uncomfortable for people, you know. It's intimidation really, people are afraid to say anything really which is fair enough. People don't want to get involved, I understand because they have to live there...

Researcher: Absolutely...

Interviewee: They've to use the buses everyday and I would never expect anyone to get involved.

Researcher: Would you say that maybe people will stay on the lower deck?

Interviewee: Yes, you'll always find certain people always head to the back of the bus. And you know, most people, certain people will head downstairs. Cause they know there'll be certain problems or abuse upstairs, so they just stay away from it.

Researcher: Ethnic minorities or...

Interviewee: Eh, you would never...it would be very unusual now to find a foreign person now sitting up the top on the back seat of the 78A. Unless they made a mistake.

Researcher: They'd be likely to get some abuse?

Interviewee: Ah they would. I'm not saying everyone would but you could get it. You'd be more likely to get it, you know. Whereas you jumper on the back of the 46A you'd likely be ok, you know.

Researcher: Yeah. Any specific kind of major events or things that you witnessed that would stand out in your mind?

Interviewee: Em, where would I start there.

Researcher: Any one you like.

Interviewee: Just trying to think now.

Researcher: No problem.

Interviewee: No we had eh...the last real incident we had on the bus was a fella and he was about six foot and we charged him over his ticket and he kind of lost the plot a bit and he was jumping on the seat and he was threatening to bite our face and all that sort of stuff. Now he was...

Researcher: How old was he?

Interviewee: I think he was only 16 or 17 or something at the time, you know?

Researcher: Okay.

Interviewee: We called for the Guards and all, we just held him and detained him. Obviously is a person threatened to bite you, you don't know. Well we always just call the Guards. If there's a problem like that we just call the Guards.

Researcher: You'd work very closely with...

Interviewee: Ah we would yeah. We've a very good relationship with a lot of the Garda stations around, you know. They'd normally have a fairly quick response for us, you know.

Researcher: Any other strange incidents or...

Interviewee: Just trying to think. I'll probably go down stairs and think of loads of them. I can't think off the top of my head, I suppose it's just most of the time on a normal day the most you'll come across would be bogey passes, you know. Fare evasion and whatever fault, robbed tickets or... You know a lot of the time we have forged or photocopied social welfare passes...or their friend's passes. That would normally on a day to day basis be what you'd get, you know. Again that would normally be on certain routes more than others, you know.

Researcher: Yeah. So the 78A would be fairly high?

Interviewee: Well it would be one of the high profile routes really yeah.

Researcher: Ok so you've been doing this job a year but you've been doing stance a number of years?

Interviewee: ___ years doing stance [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: ___ years [hic no. of years omitted]. Em, would you say the problem of anti-social behaviour on Dublin Bus has improved in recent years?

Interviewee: Well I think definitely the cameras have made a big difference!

Researcher: The cameras.

Interviewee: Oh absolutely. They have made a big difference, especially with the new buses because they're... I mean I'm sure they see them on television as well, photo fits of people. They're very conscious of them, you know. And I have to say it's a great asset because if something happens on a bus... actually we'd a fella there the other day on a 51 and he was taking pictures of a young girl. We checked the bus upstairs and we came down and this girl came down crying. The minute we asked her what was wrong with her, she said the fella up the back keeps taking pictures of me. So we went up and challenged him, but he denied it. Then I said to him well I tell you, obviously we have eight cameras on the bus and we'll be getting the video off it. Obviously if your lying, I'll be telling the Guards that your lying. And then he obviously cam clean then and said we'll okay I was taking them. Because he knew the video evidence would...

Researcher: How many cameras are inside the bus?

Interviewee: Well eight overall but, on the older buses say you've a camera on the front of the bus upstairs, which makes it very hard to see the back seat. But on the newer buses you've a camera in the middle of the bus so it's easier to see them. It's easier to see the back seat from there now which is brilliant now, you know.

Researcher: Yeah. Any other interventions or... things you notice?

Interviewee: How do you mean now?

Researcher: Em, like driver screens or no longer using coins...

Interviewee: Oh yeah. Improvements. Well as a driver I was robbed twice myself. We use to handle money at that time now, you know. But I happened to be robbed on the 78A as well, the 79. But obviously it has cut down on aggravations, like a huge amount of assaults... there was one a week in Conyngham Road at one time, there was a huge amount of assaults. Definitely yeah, it's also time wise it's fantastic, obviously people aren't waiting on change and coming back to me. You do away with a bit of fare evasion and you also do away with the temptation for the driver also, you know. I'm not saying the drivers would, but I'm just saying... doesn't have that temptation. And for the driver's

sake as well he doesn't have to be counting at the garage as well...and could be short, and all that sorts...

Researcher: No bother...

Interviewee: Ah yeah. Much better, you know?

Researcher: Yeah. Do you think more could be done...

Interviewee: Well I suppose we can always keep looking to do something better you know, but of course when you fix one problem your going to come across another one, you know?

Researcher: Of course, yeah.

Interviewee: You just have to keep, keep working at it, you know. Keep plugging away, obviously safety is a big thing at the moment. You know, so you obviously have to try and keep an eye on lads and make sure their safety comes first overall, over anything. Their driving happens...and all bus...and ourselves getting on buses, you know [hic safety of all Dublin Bus staff]. Getting on buses keeping an eye if there's anything amiss cause that way your in a position to deal with it, you know?

Researcher: And of course you work very closely in conjunction with the Gardaí.

Interviewee: Exactly yeah.

Researcher: Ok that's brilliant. Thanks _____ [hic name omitted].

Transcript 4

Researcher: How long have you worked in Dublin Bus?

Interviewee: I'm coming up now __ years [hic no. of years omitted] in January in Dublin Bus altogether.

Researcher: __ years [hic no. of years omitted]. And you have been doing the Zero Tolerance Unit (ZTU) for how long?

Interviewee: Since...I've only been promoted since __ __ __ __ [hic no. of years omitted] so I'm at it now since January, January __ __ [hic no. of years omitted]. Now I'm in the zero tolerance, only promoted __ __ [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: And what were you doing before that?

Interviewee: I was driving for __ years [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: Grand. How do you find the ZTU? How would you describe it say for somebody who is not familiar with it?

Interviewee: Oh it was an eye-opener. It was an eye-opener more than anything...coming from

a different perspective from a driver to an inspector. Certainly on a bus there was a whole lot more going on than maybe I would have been aware of. It's extremely interesting work, extremely enjoyable work. But it certainly opens your eyes to some things that were going on a bus that you maybe weren't even aware of; as a driver, you know?

Researcher: Yeah. And what kind of things would you witness that maybe you had no idea that was...

Interviewee: Well you witness from the smallest little things to maybe you know. From maybe people with feet on the seats all the way up to maybe heroin being taken on buses. You've got the whole range straight across you know from maybe smoking cigarettes to all kinds of drugs. Everything, you know you ticket evasion, but obviously being the most extreme are drug users who...it's a perfect place well nearly a perfect place to shoot up nearly on a bus, you know. And they do, and they do it quite frequent, you know.

Researcher: Ok, so you're saying: drug use, smoking. What kinds of other anti-social behaviour would you normally see on buses?

Interviewee: Well, you'll have obviously the consumption of alcohol which is obviously illegal as well on buses. You'll always get that you know. There'll be a group of people going out on a Saturday night who maybe aren't causing that much harm...someone then maybe is getting disruptive then on a bus cause he is consuming alcohol. But your getting other things as well you know, obviously it's rare but fights can break out on buses and that kind of thing, you know. But that really is a rare occurrence now, you know?

Researcher: Yeah, yeah. So, eh in terms of say areas. Would you say some areas are more likely to have problems than others?

Interviewee: Oh yeah certainly. It would be the same key areas.

Researcher: What kind of areas would you say?

Interviewee: Well you have: the Ballymun's, the Ballyfermot, Tallaght, Clondalkin to a lesser degree. Ballyfermot would certainly stick out above all other areas. Way beyond all other areas, Ballyfermot is by far the worst. I mean every bus you get on there be something there for you. Something on every bus, you know.

Researcher: Yeah that's interesting. Could you give me your thoughts on these certain routes if I throw them at you?

Interviewee: Oh yeah, work away yeah.

Researcher: Well now the 78A?

Interviewee: The 78A, the worst route in the Dublin Bus network by far. I mean generally when you get on the bus, even people who aren't doing anything wrong look. I mean your not liked from the off. The one thing you have to say is that they have great community spirit. They do stick together up there and they'll look out for each other whether they know each other or not. So you'll always get a bit of heckling on the street and on the bus when you get on up there, you know. You're really not liked up there at all, you know, so. There's always four of us up there, always four of us.

Researcher: So what kind of anti-social behaviour would you say goes on up there?

Interviewee: Well you'll have stone throwing in areas as well. These are the kinds of areas where stones are coming at buses, smashing windows. Any sorts of interference with the buses... always seems to be with the younger age anyway. The under 16 and that, would be more their end of things. But all the buses like I said you have the fare evasion and this thing with the social welfare passes which is, you know, a major problem.

Researcher: Ok, em the 77?

Interviewee: The 77, problems on it but I'd say to a lesser degree than 78A. But still up there with the bad routes. I'd say second tier of bad routes, 77's I'd say you'd have similar problems...

Researcher: How many tiers would you say there are?

Interviewee: I'd say, I'd have about maybe three or four tiers of...what you say...ranking how bad a route is alright.

Researcher: And what would you have at the top, the 78A?

Interviewee: The 78A I would say is the very top, and I mean you would probably put maybe the 13's of Ballymun and the 77's of Tallaght- probably all go into that one group. I mean Finglas, Finglas doesn't be as bad I find. Finglas you

could get on buses all day and not have a problem, maybe you could get on one and have major problems but...

Researcher: So it's hit and miss?

Interviewee: It is yeah. Finglas doesn't have the same levels of problems certainly as the top three routes. Maybe then you'd have a mid range of routes and you have the ones where you virtually never have any problems.

Researcher: So what would we say would be the middle range, what kind of...

Interviewee: Em you'd look at routes I suppose, maybe routes like something like the 29A. Where most of the customers there's very little problems and there's never a problem with stone throwing. But it does serve certain areas where they may be certain people who from time to time...you can expect some problems on it.

Researcher: Where does the 29A go to?

Interviewee: It goes to Donaghmede out past Kilbarrick out to Donaghmede; and that would be a middle range one, you know.

Researcher: And what about the 46A?

Interviewee: 46A, very little trouble. But I mean every bus has the potential to have trouble. The first time I ever had a problem on a bus was on a 46A, when I was on my own. When someone took a hold of me...

Researcher: What happened?

Interviewee: It was, I was checking tickets and I took a ticket off a gentleman. It was perfectly valid, not a problem in the world. Em...something he took a dislike to, whether he thought I was going to take his name, his details...but he felt the need he was getting off the bus. And he was getting off the bus right at that moment. And I was in his way so he grabbed me, the two of us sort of struggled until he got past me and ran off the bus.

Researcher: Had he been drinking or...

Interviewee: Well I, I really didn't have time to...all I knew was I picked up his ticket, his ticket was valid so there wasn't a problem in the world and I continue on. But something for whatever reason...

Researcher: Unforeseen circumstances...

Interviewee: He decided maybe I want to get out of here and this man is keeping me here, or whatever it was, but sure.

Researcher: So you say you've been doing the job __ __ [hic no. of years omitted] now and your finding it quite interesting...

Interviewee: Yeah.

Researcher: Would you say now that you can suss out whether there's going to be any problems on a bus?

Interviewee: Oh yeah indeed. You do get tuned in, especially with the lads that I've been working with. Who have been doing it a lot longer than me. They were to me, when I first started they were so clued in. They could pick up on something so quickly.

Researcher: And what kinds of things would you pick up on?

Interviewee: You'd be picking up on people's body language on the bus very quick. I mean when you go upstairs you normally go to the front of the bus to check tickets. But while you're at the front your eye will keep flicking to the back...and you keep seeing cause that's generally where your problems are going to be. And you're listening and your watching, from the body movements your going to see if anyone is coming towards me to the stairs, to get off. Is he sitting back like, is he sliding back in the chair, is he ready with an attitude. You're

trying to have a look at the picture before you come across how you're going to deal with it, you know.

Researcher: Ok, so could you give us an idea say of the most common offenders. What age would they be?

Interviewee: Em, it would be difficult to put an age on it. I mean, I would say possibly the biggest offenders your looking at would be maybe 18-30. You know what I mean. But still that would be a fairly general statement in that regard. It would be very hard, unless you had official stats in front of you. I don't think you could pin it down really to one age.

Researcher: Would you say it's maybe male more so than female?

Interviewee: Yeah. I would say the majority...

Researcher: But you would have problems with women...

Interviewee: Oh yeah. Of course you would come across...especially in the bad areas, you'll have people, females as well, who would give you problems. But generally I would say probably 75% would be male as oppose to 25%. But that's opinion more than stat, you know?

Researcher: Yeah. So in terms of other people and anti-social behaviour, how big a problem do you think it would be for other passengers?

Interviewee: For other passengers putting up with anti-social behaviour?

Researcher: Yeah...

Interviewee: Well I'm sure there has been times when it has helped, and it has felt great when we've gone out and on specific occasions when we've gone out to track an ongoing smoking problem...it's the same passenger each day. And there was one particular instance where there was a smoker consistently on a 51 and we went out on an undercover operation and...I should have stated that before...and you could sense the feeling of it and people stopped us when we got off the bus. You know, thanks very much it's been going on for ages. You know they were actually appreciative, at long last this person had been caught, you know, it just took time. So the passengers certainly appreciate it, you know they're experiencing it maybe on the same bus everyday. They have to deal with it first hand, they have to put up with it, you know. Until we can get around to sorting the problem out, so it could be...they are you know, they're delighted. On certain routes their delighted, their problems have been solved, you know?

Researcher: Yeah, so your saying you were a driver on a bus for __ __[hic no. of years omitted]?

Interviewee: __ years [hic no. of years omitted].

Researcher: And you've been with Dublin Bus nearly __ years...[hic no. of years omitted].

Interviewee: Yeah...

Researcher: And would you say you've noticed much improvements in the area of anti-social behaviour in that time or...

Interviewee: Em, I'd say, I'd say like I mean...going back to the bad bad years where it was such a regular occurrence with windows being smashed on buses on certain routes on a regular basis. It doesn't happen so much now, not to the same degree. You get certain routes, for a certain amount of weeks, where all of a sudden it feels like they're being targeted. A load of broken windows come up there. But between the Guards and between ourselves, generally when there's a big problem our presence for just a few days can often solve the problem. Even something as simple as school holidays, when that finishes the broken windows stop, you know. Things like that always make a difference, you know.

Researcher: So you say certain times of the year would be worse than others? Times of the day maybe?

Interviewee: Times of the day. Yeah, well obviously most anti-social behaviour, once it's night-time, once it's dark. It increases and certainly problems increases, weekends, yeah of course there'll be Friday and Saturday nights. You have the addition of alcohol coming into the equation as well, you know. But overall I'd say it's got better over the years as oppose to the bad days when there use to be broken windows everywhere.

Researcher: What would you put that down to?

Interviewee: I put that down to the Gardaí. I put that down to the inspectors, just presence, again more presence. Visible presence, but one of the biggest things I'd say, that I probably failed to mention which makes a massive difference. Is that when the service is withdrawn, say for a broken window, the other people start to get affected. And again, it's about getting the community on your side. If the community aren't happy, then the people who are perpetrating these who are part of the community...then the community themselves solves the problem, you know. It's a huge, once the service is withdrawn it makes a difference.

Researcher: Do you think anything more could be done to improve the situation?

Interviewee: Ah yeah there can always be more done. Once it's happening you can always do more. As long as there's broken windows and anti-social behaviour there's always more and something to be done. You know educating in these areas. You know talking to these people. I mean I know the Gardaí do it and Dublin Bus do it as well. I mean go into schools and speak to them, the importance of...

Researcher: Do you think more of that would be more helpful...

Interviewee: Oh certainly. I think that it should be one of the main priorities to get into these areas and talk to them, and get involved in the communities, you know. Rather than: being disliked, or not known, or getting on a bus and...having a cap...and you're this imposing figure telling somebody how it is. If you can come at them without the cap and see them in the school and talk to them. And even bring the kids to a garage, bring them around Dublin Bus, sure all these things will help, you know?

Researcher: Oh absolutely. Em, any particular incidents that you experienced on a bus of anti-social behaviour. An incident that really stood out in your mind...

Interviewee: Eh, I suppose the one on the 46A that I've mentioned, because it was the first incident I experienced...

Researcher: Have you experienced any since then?

Interviewee: Em, there's been a couple of incidents but no-one's ever physically put their hands on me since then. And I've never felt cornered you know, in any shape or form. I'd never felt under immediate threat in any particular area. One thing that comes out a lot is the fact that in these surveys your never on your own, I mean you've always few of yous...

Researcher: And a strong Garda presence as well. You work very closely with the Gardaí...

Interviewee: Yeah. With the smoking and the undercover smoking the Guards are always with us. There's always two community Guards with us, which is...it's not just a help...it's imperative they have to be there. You couldn't do the job without them.

Researcher: And that gives you piece of mind as well when you're under cover...

Interviewee: Ah definitely, I mean your on the bus and these aliases [hic offenders] they have... they know controllers are on the bus...and if there's smoke tracing...they can ignore the likes of them on the bus...I'd be questioned. You know, "what are you doing out here"; they're not stupid people by any stretch of the imagination. So if the Guards are absolutely imperative in these and they give you that piece of mind. You know your safe enough, they're only behind you.

Researcher: Brilliant, brilliant. We'll leave it there, thanks _____ [hic name omitted].